

A. D. 16640

STATUS OF RESEARCH IN AMERICAN GEOGRAPHY

One of a series of ten reports prepared by
Committees of the Division of Geology and
Geography, National Research Council, under
a grant from the Office of Naval Research

Contract N7onr-29124

COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY

Richard Hartshorne, Chairman	
Jan C. M. Broek	George Kish
P. E. James	Robert S. Platt
C. F. Jones	Malcolm Proudfoot
Stephen B. Jones	S. Van Valkenburg

Division of Geology and Geography

National Research Council

This is one of ten reports prepared to evaluate and
describe the current status and future potential of
research in various fields of American Geography.
The coordinators of the study were Preston E. James
and Clarence F. Jones.

National Academy of Sciences - National Research Council

Washington, D. C.

1953

POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY^a

WHAT IS POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY?

Among the characteristics of the areas of the world that differ significantly from each other, none is better known than the differences in political authority. A child's earliest picture of the world, as presented on the most common maps, shows the land areas divided solely in political units - each state in a solid color sharply contrasting with its neighbors. For many adults, this political map is the only kind of a map that is familiar even if few take it quite as literally as Huck Finn on his balloon trip with Tom Sawyer: "We're right over Illinois yet. Illinois is green, Indiana is pink . . . What's a map for? Ain't it to learn you facts?"

In disregarding area likenesses and differences in vegetation, landforms, economy or culture, these political maps present a very incomplete and distorted picture of reality. Nevertheless from the viewpoint of geography as the study of the earth as home of man, there is justification for placing strong emphasis on political areas in mapping a world in which a dominating force both in the life of man and in the development of areas is the factor of political authority organized in a system of independent, sovereign states, each differing notably from the others. Whether one lives in a humid, industrial area in Massachusetts or in a semi-arid ranching area in New Mexico may well be of less significance than the fact that in either case one is living within the United States rather than in France, or in the Soviet Union /cf. 26:238-239/.

Political geography has therefore long been recognized as an essential part of geography. It remains nevertheless one of the less-developed parts. Perhaps this is partially the result of the fact that in establishing geography as an independent field, the geographers of the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries were concerned to escape from the complete domination of political areas as a sole framework of regional study. Further, to escape from subordination to history, state-craft, and the analysis of national statistics of production, they emphasized the physical or natural factors that make for significant differences between areas, and, becoming increasingly imbued with the spirit of the rapidly developing natural sciences, they tended to ignore political boundaries almost completely /26:Chap. 2/.

a. The basic concept of this chapter and major topics to be included were agreed upon by Broek, Hartshorne, Kish, Platt, and Proudfoot on the basis of discussion at two meetings, together with written suggestions from Van Valkenburg and most especially from Stephen Jones. On this basis the report was written by Hartshorne as chairman, excepting that the original draft of the sections on "power analysis" and on The World as a Whole were written by Jones and a few other short sections by other members of the committee. Helpful criticism at various stages of writing was received from Broek, Jones and Proudfoot and a large part of the chapter was revised by the chairman as the result of the concepts developed in the first two chapters of this book.

European geographers found a much more congenial spirit of scientific cooperation among students of different countries if they concentrated on aspects of geography in which differences of opinion did not arouse nationalist motivations. American geographers, on the other hand, living and studying within the huge area of their single nation, rightly regarded its division into forty-eight arbitrary or chance units as of minor importance, but failed to recognize that that was far from true of differences among areas of independent states.

A more realistic viewpoint was forced upon geographers by the events of the first World War. A number of American geographers were called upon by the government to make studies of European territorial problems, both in preliminary work carried on at the American Geographical Society and as members of President Wilson's staff at the Peace Conference. None of them had had specific training in political geography and none had published in this field. It was essentially a new subject to them, to which however they were able to apply their geographic training but without being able to draw on any system of methods, terminology or objectives.

Some of the geographers who participated in that work were stimulated thereby to publish studies in political geography, but none of them turned to this field as an area of specialization. In the following two decades only a handful of younger geographers concentrated their attention on political geography. At one time, Sprout suggested that political geography should be developed as part of the field of political science /68/. Many more geographers however, though not specializing in this field, were led to make studies of the political geography of the areas on which they specialized as necessary to the full understanding of the geography of those areas. Likewise in texts on major areas of the world, such as the well-known volumes by Cressey, James and Platt, increasing attention was paid to the political geography of the individual countries studied.

The Second World War led to the introduction of many more courses in political geography in colleges and universities, including teachers colleges. Interest at a lower level of education is reflected in the appearance of a school text on Geography and World Affairs /47/, written under the direction of a scholar of standing in political geography. The number of scholars engaged primarily in research in this field however remains small. In perhaps no other branch of geography has the attempt to teach others gone so far ahead of the pursuit of learning by the teachers.

Since much of what has been published in political geography has resulted less from concern to develop a field of scholarship, and more from a desire to contribute to an understanding of international problems, it is not surprising that there has been little agreement on the nature and scope of the field. At the time when Bowman wrote the first major work in this field in America there was no "body of principles or body of doctrine with respect to political geography," nor did he attempt to construct one. Rather his
b. From a letter written by I. Bowman in 1937, in which he added that "there were political geographies, a bundle of nationalistic philosophies outside the scope of science."

New World /6/ represented a study of international relations as viewed by a geographer. In that field it pioneered a new path by its method of examining the specific territorial problems of the world, country by country, in contrast either to diplomatic history or to principles of international law and international relations. In the discussions of the specific problems however students found no method or system demonstrating a distinctive character for political geography, with the important exception, generally recognized as the most valuable contribution of the work, that an extraordinarily large amount of material was presented in maps.

In his review of the field early in the 1930's, /20/ Hartshorne found in the publications of American, or English geographers no clear basis for determining the purpose and scope of political geography, but sought to establish that by introducing the system developed by contemporary German geographers on the foundations laid a generation earlier by Ratzel. In the meantime, Whittlesey, who first among American geographers developed political geography as an academic subject of teaching and research, had released himself from the domination of the historical environmentalism of Sample and Barrows - reflected in his early study of the historical relations of the United States and Cuba /92/ - and was demonstrating the new viewpoint being developed in American geography as a whole by treating political geography as the differentiation of political phenomena from place to place over the earth. Illustrated in various substantive works, this view is outlined in a short article in 1935 /95/, and a few years later in the introductory pages of his major work, essentially a collection of essays in political geography /98/. At the same time appeared Van Valkenburg's textbook, presenting a quite different view of the field /84/.

Geopolitics

With the outbreak of the Second World War, the interest in political geography was again focused on the immediate problems of international relations, particularly that of the geography of power. Many American geographers, as well as the general public and many military leaders, were impressed by exaggerated reports of the influence purportedly exerted on German strategic planning by the school of geopolitics which Haushofer had developed in Germany. Consequently it became difficult to distinguish between political geography and the supposedly new field of geopolitics.^c

The difficulty in determining the distinction between the two fields was intensified by lack of any clear statement by the followers of geopolitics, whether in Germany or later in this country, as to the purpose and scope of that field. Haushofer's statements of his own views tended to add confusion

c. Whittlesey /98:59/ and others following him, used the adjective form "geopolitical" not in the sense used by the German students of geopolitics, but simply as a useful abbreviation of the cumbersome phrase "political-geographic."

rather than to clarify, though his basic purposes ultimately became quite clear.^d

In his early attempt to analyze the German work in geopolitics, in 1935, Hartshorne discussed these difficulties, but concluded that geopolitics, as viewed by the more conservative members of the group, represented simply the application of the knowledge and techniques of political geography to the problems of international relations /20:960-965/. But as it was soon evident that these problems require many other kinds of knowledge, geopolitics, having gained popular success as a catch-word, became both broader in scope and narrower in purpose - namely, to include the application of all kinds of knowledge about foreign areas to the problems of foreign policy of the German state.

Whittlesey demonstrated a considerable correspondence between the conclusions presented in scattered writings of Haushofer and others of the group on the one hand and the actual strategy subsequently followed by Hitler /99/. The German geographer Troll, however, in his post-mortem on the school of geopolitics /80/ makes it at least doubtful that this correspondence represented a direct cause and effect relationship. Further, if such a relationship did result, from early personal contact of Haushofer, it is not clear which of the two had greater influence on the other. There can be no question however that Haushofer and his group, through publication and by teaching of young journalists, made very important contributions to internal propaganda, supplying a pseudo-scientific rationalization for the Nazi policy of expansion.

Nevertheless many students in this country, both geographers and political scientists, urged the development of a field of geopolitics purified of its nationalistic German origins. They would look back to Mackinder and Mahan rather than Haushofer, but they overlooked the fact that neither of those individuals had attempted, any more than Haushofer, to lay the groundwork of a field of study, but had merely used what knowledge and techniques were available to them to draw conclusions for action on certain problems of power. Spykman, who had previously presented to his colleagues in political science detailed discussions of the importance of geography to foreign policy /71/ adopted the term, and many of the concepts of geopolitics, to his war-time studies of the situation and needs of the United States /72;73/. His conclusions as well as those of less influential students were strongly opposed by various critics. Weigert concluded his analysis of the German school with an emphatic warning lest the American prophets of geopolitics should indoctrinate both military leaders and the public in this country with doctrines no less dangerous than those that had been propagated in Germany /88/.

The disagreements that arose were not of the kind commonly involved in the attempt to determine facts and relationships; rather they stem from

d. Haushofer, whom the writer of this section found quite able to speak simple and clear German, wrote in a style extremely difficult for German as well as foreign readers, whether because of inability to write clear prose or with the intention of obfuscating his reasoning while impressing his conclusions is not certain.

differences in fundamental assumptions of purpose and aspiration, assumptions seldom stated clearly either by the writer who held them or the opposing critics. Such failure to recognize basic assumptions is perhaps to be expected in a field whose nature and scope remains nebulous. One proponent, Walsh, while urging the development of "a future geopolitics, born of sanity and law and equity" provides no more definite concept of the field than to say "geopolitics, by which is meant a combined study of human geography and applied political science" /86:34, 2/.

The statement just quoted reflects the intellectual difficulty involved in defining any applied field. The economic geographer who attempts to apply his knowledge to any practical problem finds that his problem makes it immediately necessary to consider matters not commonly regarded as included in geography. In the application of knowledge to concrete problems, the problems determine what shall be studied; definitions of fields of study as divisions of the whole field of knowledge become "academic" in the sense of not useful to the purpose /26:399-400/.

Thus, the erection of a single bridge may involve problems not only of the physics and chemistry of metals and the aesthetics of architectural design, but also problems of hydrography, geology, economics of transportation, and labor problems. Bridge construction and state-craft both require the integration of information, principles and techniques from many disciplines; it does not follow that either can be made into a discipline itself.

Finally, in the application of knowledge to concrete problems, the question of purpose is always involved. If the purpose can be assumed as accepted by all students concerned in the development of an applied field - as is commonly true in such cases as the application of medical knowledge to the prevention of disease, or the application of engineering knowledge to the construction of bridges - the answer to the question is universal and no problem arises. Just the opposite is the case in the application of knowledge to the concrete problems of international relations: every state concerned has a different purpose and these are most often in conflict. As an applied field concerned with specific problems, geopolitics would appear to be inevitably divided into as many different schools as there are independent states.

Convergence of Political Geography and Political Science

Nevertheless the convergence of students from geography and other social science fields on the problems of war and peace must be welcomed and encouraged, not only for the aid it may give statesmen in reaching tolerable conclusions on international problems, but also for the sake of the increasing depth of understanding in all fields that should result from such cross-fertilization.

The geographer, concerned with the study of regions, has found in the political unit an example of a region organized in spite of internal regional differences and is concerned to study the structure and functions of that area as a region homogeneous in political organization, heterogeneous in other respects. The political scientist, concerned with the study of political

processes, has found he must do more than develop generalizations independent of differences in different areas; the processes which can only be partially described and analyzed in generalizations, must be studied as they operate in particular areas; he has been led increasingly to the study of what may be called regional politics.

Likewise in the field of international relations, grim reality has compelled students from all disciplines to focus on what may be called power analysis - the analysis of political units of power and the relations among them. Since these political units are defined by area and the relations among them are conditioned by space relations, geographers have long shown an interest in such problems. One of them, Mackinder, presented nearly half a century ago, a thesis of world power analysis and prognosis which for better or worse has become the most famous contribution of modern geography to man's view of his political world /54/. Mackinder's interest and purpose, it may be noted, were primarily political and practical and it is not surprising therefore that his hypothesis is much less firmly grounded than, for example, his more academic and geographic analysis of the foundation of Britain's seapower in the relation of Great Britain to "the British seas" /55/.

Though many geographers have quoted and used Mackinder's thesis of the "heartland," Weigert is one of the few who have examined it critically /69/. It would appear to have greater interest for students of world politics, like Spykman, who examined it critically and attempted a major revision /73/.

The influence of geography, including particularly both the major contributions of Mackinder's thinking, are likewise notable in the work of Sprout and Sprout - an academic as well as personal union in which there was included a considerable ingredient of geographic training. This influence is clear in their studies of seapower - notably in that on the Command of the Atlantic /69/ and in their Foundations of National Power /70/. The latter may be considered as a volume on regional politics, constructed by the editors by putting together pieces of many kinds of published materials, together with pieces contributed by the editors themselves, in which a substantial amount of geography is included.

Similarly Lattimore's war-time and post-war studies of the Far East may be considered as studies in regional politics, in which the author is concerned to find solutions for current problems on the basis of his specialized area competency, including an intimate knowledge of much of its geography; his Situation in Asia may be cited as one of several well-known works /53/. Of a somewhat different kind, concerned primarily with strategic problems in a single region of strategic unity is Reitzel's book on The Mediterranean /66/.

Examination of almost any part of any of the works mentioned in the previous paragraphs reveals the almost unlimited variety of things that must be assessed if one is to reach a thorough evaluation of national power - a list that may quite literally include shoes and ships and sealing wax, cabbages and kings.

Geographers can and have contributed information and techniques for the evaluation of many of these factors. In greatest volume, perhaps, have been

studies of the physical and economic conditions within particular countries, studies prepared for governmental use and therefore, unfortunately not published. One major aspect of production for national power, the occurrence and development of mineral resources essential for modern industry and war, has been most intensively studied and presented in well-known works of economic geologists such as Leith.

Geographers in addition have contributed studies of the strategic situation of major world areas, demonstrating the geographic technique of viewing power distribution in terms of space relationships. A number of such studies are included in the two symposia edited by Weigert, Stefansson and Harrison /90; 91/ and Stephen Jones has published several in the series of Memoranda of the Yale Institute of International Studies /46/.

Many other factors of national power however, are foreign to geographic training. For the evaluation, say, of the strength or weakness inherent in the one-party dictatorship of the Soviet Union versus the two-party democracy supporting a strong executive in Great Britain, or the multi-party legislature dominating the executive in France, the knowledge and technique of the student of government is essential.

Nevertheless it is of the utmost practical importance that the problems of international relations should be studied by students from all disciplines that can contribute to their solution. Workers from the various fields will and should seek to integrate, either in groups or as individuals, the findings from the several disciplines in relation to the specific problems. Furthermore, as in every other part of geography, the individual geographer in order to work effectively in his field of specialization must develop considerable mastery of the related social science and it is therefore to be expected that he will at times be concerned to study problems which might logically be considered as included in the related field, as in geographic politics, rather than within the field of geography.

To say that there is need for convergence of students from many fields however is not to claim that a new field should be set up, particularly if it continues to prove impossible to define such a field other than in terms of the border fields it proposes to overlap. Geography and political science are mutually concerned not only with different topics in international relations but with topics that concern only areas within a single state. If the specific topic of the analysis of units of national power and their interrelations represents a distinct area of convergence, not only of geography and political science but also of economics, anthropology and psychology, it would seem well to name that topic by a clear and distinct term, such as "power analysis" rather than obscure it by the all-embracing term of geopolitics whose origin is steeped in error, exaggeration and poison.

Finally, experience from the history of science indicates that each discipline will be able to render the maximum contribution if it develops to the utmost its own body of principles and techniques, to be sure not in isolation from related disciplines but rather in independent interrelation. In the remainder of this chapter, therefore, attention will be concentrated on political geography as an integral part of the field of geography.

Political Geography in Geography

Even if we consider political geography as a body of knowledge rather than an applied field and as contained within geography, there is far from agreement among American geographers as to the nature and scope of this portion of their field.

This is illustrated in the great variety of method followed by the many geographers who contributed to the two symposia on political geography, *Compass of the World*, and *New Compass of the World* /90; 91/. It is even more striking, in view of its apparently uniform organization and purpose, in the textbook on World Political Geography edited by Percy Fiffeld /60/. In the introductory chapters by Renner and Percy, political geography is identified with a geopolitics purified of its irrelevant Nazi aspects. Renner attempts to summarize the different viewpoints of American political geographers in terms of three schools, but one may doubt whether the scholars he names would accept his interpretation of their writings. However there is little indication that the writers of the individual chapters were guided by the views expressed in the introductory chapters.

The earlier attempts of Whittlesey and Hartshorne to determine the nature of the field have been mentioned previously. Somewhat different views have been offered by Stephen Jones /44/ and Wright /102/. More recently, and partly as a result of preliminary discussions of this committee, Hartshorne presented in his address as president of the Association in 1949, an appeal for "a more geographical political geography" in a paper /31/ which emphasized the "functional approach" to the subject, thereby marking a major change as compared with the views he had published in 1935.

Discussions in the Committee appointed to prepare this chapter demonstrated not merely the existence of a variety of views regarding the scope of this field, which might well be a healthy situation. But geographers have tended to nibble at the more obvious aspects, such as boundaries, capitals or international waterways, or on the other hand when endeavoring to cover the political geography of a whole state or larger area they have had in mind no systematic concept of what topics should be included, of what questions should be posed for which answers are to be sought.

The committee therefore felt that both in reviewing the work that has been done and to offer possible guidance for future work, it was desirable not merely to determine the major topics that have been studied in political geography, but to arrange these in an organized system that would make clear the relation of each topic to the whole and reveal the major gaps that need development. With such a framework any geographer interested in examining particular topics in political geography could see the relationship of his topic to the field as a whole and to the overall study of area likenesses and differences, that is, to geography.

It is appropriate for geographers to begin not with a verbal definition but with a map. The primary facts in political geography are presented whether quite accurately or not, in the common political map. We noted at the start of this chapter that such a map presents an important degree of reality in

showing each sovereign state in a different color but the same color throughout all its area, but we also noted that the respects in which such a map conceals important differences. We know that, in any particular case, some parts of a state may consist of barren mountains, others of fertile lowlands; some parts may be highly industrialized with primarily urban populations, others are largely rural and agricultural; there may be different languages spoken in different parts of the same state and diverse religions followed; portions of the state area may have recently belonged to another state and their populations may still feel themselves attached to the former state rather than to the one in which as a result of war they have been assigned; or indeed areas long recognized as parts of the state may be largely wilderness inhabited by scattered tribes who hardly know even the name of the state in which they are included on the political map.

While these cases refer to sovereign states, similar conditions may be found in political divisions at lower levels. Thus the State of Tennessee is presented on the common political map as a homogeneous unit and on many maps purporting to show political attitudes, it has appeared in the past as a part of "the solid South," blanketed as terrain of one political part. Closer inspection, however, shows that over a third of the counties may have majorities of the opposite party, and the regions revealed by mapping this data show marked correspondence to the economic and racial differences in the several portions of the state - the Mississippi lowlands, Nashville Basin, Tennessee Valley, and the mountain region. These contrasts are significant not merely for those interested in interpreting or predicting election returns; the political differences and the cultural, economic and physical differences which underly them, present serious problems to the operation of the State of Tennessee as a coherent unit.⁶

In each of the cases cited in the previous paragraphs, the geographer analyses the area concerned by the regional method - that is, on the basis of a series of criteria relevant to political problems, he determines the regional differences and similarities within the area and by comparative study of the regional breakdown revealed by each criterion, seeks for evidence of correspondence that may suggest a cause and effect relationship.

Political geography then we may define as the study of areal differences and similarities in political character as an interrelated part in the total complex of areal differences and similarities which all geography seeks to establish and interpret. Interpretation of the areal differences in political features involves the study of their interrelations with all other relevant areal variations, whether physical or human.

SUBJECTS AND METHODS OF STUDY IN POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY

Area Differences in Political Character

One group of problems in political geography concerns the differences

e. This particular example is chosen out of many that might have been used because the source from which it is taken, "Physiographic Influences in the Development of Tennessee," in 1915, demonstrates an early recognition of the significance of political geography within geography /17/.

in attitudes of people in different areas on various political matters. Studies of such topics are very similar to other cultural phenomena outlined in the previous chapter and in this case also, relatively little attention has been paid to such problems by American geographers.

A well-known exception is Wright's map of the voting habits of American people, as revealed by compilation on a county basis, of election returns over a long period of time /101/. This study however does little more than depict the facts, but it invites detailed studies of particular areas to interpret the significance of the facts shown. Thus, the breakdown of the "solid South" into a complex pattern of regional differences calls for comparative analysis with regional maps of such features as racial composition, agricultural systems, soils, and landforms. Crysler has pursued this subject in studies of political regionalism in Missouri /12;13/.

A recent doctoral dissertation at the University of Wisconsin, by Smuckler, a student of political science who was also trained in geography, attempts the more complex task of mapping and analyzing the regions of isolationist attitude in the United States. Although this study confirms a general impression of concentration of isolationist attitudes in the Midwest, the marked variations within that area and the presence of equally isolationist districts in other parts of the country give strong reason for believing that the interior location of the area is not the basic factor; more important, it would appear, are differences among predominantly urban, small-town, and rural districts and differences resulting from different cultural and national origins. Detailed analyses to determine the significance of each of these however has not been carried out.

Until recently the data available to measure political attitudes has been limited largely to election returns or voting records of elected representatives. Today these could be greatly increased by use of the records of public opinion polls and "content analyses" of newspapers and publications. To use such data for geographic analysis however it is necessary that the results be tabulated in much smaller divisions of area than is now the case. Few of these are broken down even by states within the United States, whereas Smuckler's study demonstrates that the totals for States obscures the significant relationships revealed by the smaller areas of Congressional Districts, and his further study of voting by counties within an electoral district makes clear that the latter level is likewise too large.

Areas Organized as Political Units

The distinctive characteristic of political geography however arises from the fact that in practically all parts of the world today, political organization represents not the organization of a particular kind or class of people but rather the organization of a particular area, including along with the other contents of the area the people permanently resident within it. The legal establishment of any political unit, whether a sovereign state, a province, department, county or township is the declaration that, in terms of the criterion of common government, that area shall constitute a region. This is the one case in geography in which the regional division of any area appears as a primary fact, rather than as the result of study /26:402-404/. Whether

this appearance, as presented by law, represents reality however, is a question to which we must return later.

It may be that a region established by political action corresponds to a region determined by other criteria, whether a uniform region - as for example in terms of the linguistic character of its people, or a nodal region - in terms of economic development and transport. In such a case, a cause and effect relationship is obviously probable, but only historical study can determine in which direction - i.e., whether the political region was established to conform with the linguistic or economic region, or whether the latter was the result of a long established political unity.

In many other cases however there may be little correspondence between the regional division as defined politically (i.e., by law, whether domestic or international) and other regional divisions of the same area as determined by other relevant characteristics.

The full reality of homogeneity of a political region is not expressed merely by the fact that the area has been legally established as a political unit of government. In some cases indeed the situation shown on the ordinary political map as sanctioned by law or international treaty may have little or no reality. Thus, Platt told in 1935 of an Indian tribe in the upper reaches of the Amazon who live "in blissful ignorance of the fact that they inhabit a zone of international tension," an area bitterly claimed as part of the political region of Peru and simultaneously of that of Ecuador; the inhabitants had no knowledge of the existence of those units or of what the difference between them might be /62:273/.

The degree of homogeneity of a political region is to be measured both in terms of the degree to which the various functions for which the region is organized politically uniformly over the area, and the degree to which political forces tie the area together into a coherent (nodal or kinetic) region. The first of these conditions is significant at all levels of political division, the second is primarily important in the case of the independent units formed by sovereign states, and of decreasing importance at successive lower levels of subdivision.

At all levels of division, political units of area differ in the degree of regional homogeneity, as measured by the two conditions indicated. In no small part these differences are due to varying degree of heterogeneity of non-political features within the area which is intended to be politically homogeneous. A major part of the study in political geography therefore is concerned with the determination of the degree of political homogeneity and the relation of that to the regional pattern in other factors.

Political geography, in this more limited sense, then, may be considered as the study of the organization of the world into political areas, examined individually and in relation to each other, in relation to other relevant likenesses and differences of areas. It is in terms of this more limited view of this branch of geography that the remainder of this chapter will consider work in political geography. It is also in this respect that

political geography is most closely interrelated with other major branches of the field, a theme which Whittlesey has discussed in some detail /96/. The political organization of area into regional units, notably at the level of the sovereign state, has profound effects on all aspects of geography in which man is a factor, including even aspects commonly thought of as parts of physical geography, as in the geography of soils.

Area Studies and Topical Studies

In the study of political units of area as a special form of regions in geography, the two methods common to all branches of geography are employed. Some studies focus on the problems presented by the political organization of particular areas, whether a single region - that is a political unit area - or an area divided among two or more units. On the other hand the various kinds of phenomena involved in the political organization of any area may be studied generically as they occur in different areas of the world. Boundaries and capitals are the most obvious features in the political geography of any area and no doubt for this reason they have been favored subjects of topical studies by geographers. More sophisticated analysis of the phenomena involved in the development of homogeneous political units of area will reveal other topics of more fundamental importance.

The following four sections will consider the problems that arise in studies of the division of the world into political units and studies of individual units at various levels of division. In these detailed considerations of problems of areas, a large number of topics requiring generic study will emerge, the significance of historical studies will frequently be noted, and possibilities may be seen for application of knowledge to current political problems. Each of these three aspects of political geography will be summarized briefly in the remaining sections of this chapter.

STUDIES OF THE WORLD DIVIDED INTO POLITICAL UNITS

The World as a Whole

Long before man had explored the whole of his world he speculated about its totality. Much of his early speculation dwelt upon the arrangement of land and water and the distribution of climates. Since he was extrapolating from the little that was known to the vastness that was unknown, errors were hardly surprising. Today, with the physical world explored at least by reconnaissance, the great accumulation of factual data provides a much broader basis for speculation concerning the origins and global pattern of continents and ocean basins, or of climates.

In the social aspects of geography, global speculation likewise has been active. Here the tendency to extrapolate from the intimate to the unfamiliar is still prevalent. In political geography, thinking about the world as a whole has produced some notable hypotheses which still remain undemonstrated.

Such speculations are not merely fuel for intellectual fires. The object of study is the realistic world in which we live, the one actually integral unit with which geographers have to deal. This unit of course existed long before man appeared on the earth and since long before the dawn of history it has represented a real unit to the degree that man originating in one part of it was able to migrate, through successive generations, to every other part - and nowhere else. In major degree however, the unity of the world region had little significance for man until the discovery and exploration of the world by Europeans in the 15th and 16th centuries. In that relatively short time the voyages of Diaz, de Gama, Columbus and Magellan, among countless others, converted the surface of the earth into One World, increasingly since then a unit in the intellectual, economic, and military life of man.

This One World has no corresponding political organization as a unit. It is however organized, in terms of international law commonly accepted, into a single system of three kinds of areas. Land areas are organized as independent, sovereign states each of which is a unit region subject to no outside authority, or a dependent area, each organized under the control of one of the independent states. In legal theory these cover practically all the inhabited parts of the world; only Antarctica and a few uninhabited islands remain unassigned in this system. Finally the open seas are recognized as unorganized areas into which the authority of each of the organized states extends wherever ships or planes under such authority proceed. To solve the problems that arise when ships or planes of diverse state authorities come in contact in the seas, the independent states within the system have developed an elaborate structure of international law, to enforce which, however, there is no single organization.

This single state system of world organization is a product of recent times. It is new not only in covering the world, but in many parts of the world it has brought entirely new forms of political organization. In reading the narratives of early explorers, men familiar only with one kind of political organization, we are often misled by their use of such words as "king," "state," "territory," etc. In many areas political organization was defined in terms of families and tribes, with only vague references to specific pieces of land. The relations of the Chinese empire to the peoples and governments of such areas as Korea, Manchuria, or Indo-China had no direct counterpart in the European scene.

The modern world system has resulted from the spread of European power or European ideas over all other parts of the world. For a long time the world system consisted largely of the state-system of Europe together with areas elsewhere in the world organized by individual members of that system. Whittlesey's brief historical perspective of "the exploitable world" suggests the opportunity for valuable studies of the changing pattern of this system during recent centuries, a pattern that has changed markedly since he wrote in 1939 /98:78-85/. But the countries that have changed from dependence under particular European states to independence, beginning over a century ago in the Americas and more recently in southern and southeastern Asia, have organized themselves after European models and have become members of a world system of states which represents an expansion of the former European state-

system. The same has also been true of countries, like Japan and China, whose organization was never controlled by Europe.

Though the modern state-system originated in Europe, it is notably different in character, as well as extent, from the system that existed in Europe in earlier times, such as the feudal system of the middle ages. In some respects indeed the modern system is more akin to that of classical Greece, but on the other hand there is no modern counterpart of the Roman Empire - a vast domain ruled not by a state occupying what we now call Italy, but by a city, Rome.

Since the political organization of the world has changed, both in character and extent, in the past, it is reasonable to assume it will not remain the same in the future. To enable us to recognize the trend of present changes, it would be desirable to have comparative studies of the geography of the political systems of the past. This is a field of study as yet almost untouched by geographers.

Mapping The World

A first step in the analysis of the present system of world political organization is to present it on a map. We commonly assume that this is done for us by the common political map. But such maps are by no means either as accurate or as realistic as is commonly supposed.

To construct a map that will clearly depict even legal sovereignty involves problems which the ordinary map publisher avoids by purely arbitrary decisions. Current disputes over territories, as for example over the Falkland Islands, are usually resolved by the cartographer with no appeal to authority. It is difficult, without complicated symbols, to show the status of a boundary like the present one between Poland and Germany, which is regarded as final by one party and only provisional by the other. The ill-defined boundaries of Tibet appear on most maps as no less precisely determined than those of Switzerland. Whether Antarctica is divided like a pie or remains politically unidentified depends on which foreign office the cartographer consults. If one tries to complete the pattern by showing sovereignty over the territorial sea and continental shelves, Boggs finds that at least nine symbols are required, while a welter of new boundary disputes will arise if land boundaries are extended seaward without agreement as to the method of delimitation /4; 5/.

If it is difficult to map legal sovereignty with complete accuracy, obviously it is more difficult to make a world map of "political realities." The makers of such maps usually are driven to subjective judgments or tie their maps to a particular epoch. Langhans, in 1926, published a world map showing degrees of autonomy in external and internal affairs /50/. In the main, this map was based on legal documents, but some highly subjective decisions obviously were made; thus the Ukraine and Sarawak appear in the same classification.

A more complete break with political form and shift towards reality

as determined by effective political functioning was made by Hartshorne in 1941 /28/. Many of the details of specific areas are subject to question and few today will find his categories acceptable. Nevertheless this map may represent an important step in the direction of a more realistic political map of the world. A series of such maps covering a century or more of history would be very illuminating.

Maps of the world's legal systems have been published by Wignore /100/ and Whittlesey /98:556-565/. Neither of these more than scratches the surface of the geography of the law, which remains a field in which much useful digging can be done. Whittlesey's black-and-white maps shows only a single legal system in a given area, concealing the existence of compound systems such as the concurrence of Roman, Moslem, and local customary law in Indonesia. Wignore's colors make it possible to show the coexistence of systems in a given area, but he follows political boundaries almost everywhere and so does not show enclaves of tribal law in remote parts of some organized countries.

Hypotheses of The Political Division of The World

Geographers have not of course been content to map the world political pattern but have sought to explain it in terms of other patterns of world differences. In particular they have been concerned to determine reasons for the political preeminence of certain parts of the world over others. This phase of political geography however remains richer in striking hypotheses than in well-demonstrated conclusions. Through much of the work runs the strain of environmentalism, inherited from the nineteenth century.

Thus Griffith Taylor presents the problem in terms that beg the answer: "Let us pose the urgent problems in a series of simple maps and diagrams. . . . Let us explain how the patterns depend on the environment." After comparing the political map with world patterns of climates, landforms, natural resources and races, he finds the foci of the political world in the humid coal-rich lands of the northern middle latitudes /76:607/.

Ellsworth Huntington likewise concluded that Europe and North America are likely to continue to dominate world affairs, but he based his conclusion primarily on the intellectual and physical energy of the population resulting from climatic conditions, reinforced by diet and perhaps by hereditary characteristics resulting from natural selection /37/.

Mackinder, viewing the problem over a longer range of time, both past and future, saw in the pre-eminence of western Europe the special significance, during a particular epoch, of the maritime margins of the continental masses /54/. With the improved development of land communication, he foresaw the possibility of greater power development in the great interior lands, of which one, the "pivot area" or Heartland of Eurasia, was so placed as to offer the opportunity to dominate the world. Though Mackinder's hypothesis undoubtedly had a pronounced effect on Haushofer in Germany - but to his obvious regret was not followed in Hitler's policy - and has been more widely discussed in popular writings than perhaps any other contribution of modern geography to common thought, critical discussion has focused chiefly on its prognostication for the future. Unfortunately few have attempted to examine critically or

demonstrate adequately the detailed facts and relationships on which his premises are based.

Long before the writers discussed in the previous paragraphs, Ratzel had endeavored to lay the groundwork of principles in political geography that would explain the contemporary division of the areas of the world in terms of past growth of individual states /65/. Viewing the state as the organization of a section of land and a section of people, originally quite small, he viewed its growth through processes of expansion over other small units and in competition with similar growing units. Ratzel, who had been trained as a biologist, thought of states as organisms, which therefore passed through a life-cycle from birth through youth to maturity and finally to the decadence of old-age. As a geographer he sought to find this cycle not merely in internal development, but more particularly in terms of area-growth.

This theme was inherited by the German geographers who, following Kjellen in Sweden and Haushofer in Germany, developed the school of geopolitics. Semple, who brought so much of Ratzel's thinking to American geographers, had not introduced his political geography, primarily, we are told, because she found this thesis unacceptable. It has however been introduced since by Van Valkenburg, whether by transfer from Ratzel's writings or by analogy from the Davis physiographic cycle is not clear /84/. The thesis has been widely criticized not only because of lack of demonstration that the life-processes of any state have led inevitably to the characteristics that can be called old age and ultimate dissolution, but even more fundamentally, on the grounds that it is false to reason from an analogy of a biological organism with a social organization operated by men who through successive generations are at no time older than their predecessors.

Studies Needed

For the purpose of attaining an understanding of the political divisions of the world, we appear to have a plethora of hypotheses - all too commonly stated as though they were demonstrable theories - but inadequate analysis both of the actual political pattern which the map of official political areas tends to obscure and of the patterns of world distribution of many phenomena known to be relevant, or which appear likely to be relevant, to the political pattern. On the one hand we need studies in the direction initiated by Langhans and Hartshorne, to provide a much more thorough analysis of the categories of political organization and their world distribution. The pattern or patterns thus developed need then to be compared with a large number of other world patterns. While many of these, such as patterns of natural conditions, population, production and trade, have long been studied by geographers, other phenomena are less familiar but may be no less significant.

Thus we need to break down the overall data of population density, a compound of people living off the land and therefore dependent on the amount of land available for production with people supported by urban occupations for whom such figures as acreage per capita have no known significance. The significant ratio, which we know varies greatly in different areas of equal capacity for production, is the ratio of productive agricultural land to the

population working on the land and supported directly by its production. While we know these differences exist, we have barely begun the studies necessary to provide comparable measurements that can be made into a world pattern. Hartshorne has presented initial attempts for the United States /25a/ which demonstrate marked correspondence with well known patterns of political differences within that country, and students in the United States Department of Agriculture have published one such map for Europe /83:22/.

Likewise we need studies of differential rates of growth of world population, world patterns of birth and death rates. Unfortunately the available data is often given in estimates for the entire official areas of states, whereas a realistic pattern can be mapped only if we can distinguish regions known to be markedly different from each other - as in the case of the various portions of such a country as Brazil or Indonesia.

The same is true in regard to one of the most important of world patterns for political geography, the pattern of differences in levels of living. We know in general that one of the most explosive, if not the most explosive, features of the world today is the growing realization among peoples of densely populated agrarian lands that while they live on a bare margin of existence peoples in other lands are enjoying a far higher and continuously rising standard of living. But only recently, through the work of Colin Clarke and others, are we beginning to get reliable data permitting comparisons among countries and the construction of a reliable world pattern.

Studies of Sections of the World

In an age of global political relations and global wars - an age which began in the eighteenth century if not earlier - the political geographer is required to keep constantly in mind the world as a whole. But practical difficulties make it well-nigh impossible for him to study the whole pattern of world relationships at one time. Since these relationships must be seen as they are on the sphere, even the map, the geographer's distinctive tool, fails him in this purpose. Nor does the globe replace the flat map, since it is impossible to see more than half the globe at any one moment. To turn the globe around to see the other half is again like looking at the world mapped in but two hemispheres. As Bogue has discussed in his very illuminating study of "Our Hemisphere" /3/, one must consider an unlimited number of possible hemispheres, seen from all angles - as though one were to look at a globe turning and at the same time shifting its axis, and attempt to keep in mind all the different hemispheres seen.

Further, however, the student may endeavor to retain in imagination all of the space relationships involved on the globe. When he attempts to present a study of the world as a whole, he must do so by a series of analyses of its various parts. In any one part of his study, attention is focused on a limited part of the whole.

There is therefore place for studies of the organization into political units or regions of various large sections of the world. For this purpose it is advantageous to determine regions of greater size but lesser political

homogeneity than that found in individual areas of political organization.

Such regional homogeneity of relatively large areas may be based, on the one hand, on approximate uniformity of particular political characteristics or of cultural characteristics that are politically significant. Thus throughout nearly all of Latin America there is not only the obvious similarity of language among the politically dominant groups, but also similarity in certain inherited institutions of even greater importance for political organization - such as the role of family, church, social classes, and military forces in the government of society.

In these respects all of Latin America is in marked contrast with Anglo-America. Against this background of similarity throughout Latin America, its division into many independent political units is to be compared with the patterns of separation and diversity presented in terms of distribution of population, racial composition, transport systems, and historical organization inherited from colonial days, as James among others has suggested /38/. Similarly, Broek has analyzed the elements of "Unity and Diversity in South east Asia," /10/ Hartshorne has examined East Central Europe, /29/ and Roucek has studied the Balkans /67/. On the other hand, a realm may be recognized as a region of large size on the basis of coherent unity (as a nodal or kinetic region) in that its various parts, however diverse in character, have closer political relations (whether those of cooperation or of conflict) with each other than with areas outside that realm. Thus the use of the Danube for navigation has for more than a century created a certain degree of regional unity among the otherwise very diverse countries through which it flows; Kish has discussed the challenge to international planning which this situation presents /48/. A classic example, of still larger scale, is that of the Mediterranean realm, an area whose ancient homogeneity in cultural and political character was forever lost with the break-up of the Roman Empire and the later division between Christian and Moslem civilizations, but which is nonetheless bound together by sea connections into one strategic theater /98:Chap. 9/.

In the political-geographic study of such a realm, the student is concerned to determine the elements of regional homogeneity on the one hand and those of heterogeneity on the other, to compare the regional pattern of each of these elements with the pattern of political organization. In doing this, he is not concerned with all geographic elements, but only with those that are found to be pertinent to the question of political organization. Thus, in the Mediterranean realm, it is not to be assumed that the general similarity of climatic and vegetation conditions in that area should have functioned as an element for regional unity at any time since the breakdown of the Roman Empire.

The existence of separate political units in a region of kinetic unity inevitably leads to difficult problems in the functioning relations among the several units. This situation the political geographer is concerned to analyze, in terms of the different categories of relationships, and the resultant problems, that exist among political units, whether those within one realm, or in the final single region of the whole world. The method of studying these problems will be discussed in considering the analysis of the individual political regions of highest intensity, the independent states.

ANALYSIS OF THE INDIVIDUAL POLITICAL REGION

Features of the Political Unit

Any specific area of the earth that has been established by law or international treaty as a political unit and in which a governmental system has been organized and operated constitutes in theory, if not in full reality, a politically organized region. As such it presents certain features and relationships which the geographer is concerned to analyze.

1) Morphology. The region has a definite, usually quite precise, size and shape. It has internal structure as a unit, consisting of a nodal center, lines of communication from the center to all parts of the region, and features established to mark and control its boundaries. Further, it has an officially established subdivision presenting a particular geographic pattern at each successive level of subdivision.

2) Physiology. On the basis of its internal structure, the political organization maintains a constant flow of authority between the centers of government and the different parts of the region, and also, though often far less directly, between the people of different parts of the region and the political organization.

3) Location. The region occupies a particular position in a pattern of similar regions.

4) External relations. On the basis of its particular position with reference to each of these patterns, the region has relations, as a unit of operation, with other regions in the pattern, both near and far.

5) Purpose. The politically organized region is the product of a definite plan, formulated and put in effect with the conscious purpose of converting an area of heterogeneity into a homogeneous region, homogeneous both in the sense of uniformity of political character and in the sense of coherent unity (kinetic or nodal region).

In this respect the region of political organization differs from all other types of regions studied in geography, unless that term is considered as applying to such small unit areas as the individual farm, plantation, mine or industrial establishment. Perhaps its closest counterpart in economic geography was the feudal manor in the middle ages, for like that area unit, its primary purposes are internal, rather than external.

Homogeneity as the Purpose of the Political Region.

It is to further this fundamental purpose of uniformity and unity that the political physiology and internal structure of the region are developed

f. This and the following section are adapted, with modifications, from the more lengthy treatment in Hartshorne's "The Functional Approach in Political Geography," /31/.

and maintained. While it might also seem desirable to determine the external form, of size and shape, in relation to this purpose, in most cases that must be accepted, for better or worse, as pre-determined, and this of course is definitely true of the location of the area. In these respects a politically organized region differs from a plantation or industrial establishment.^g

The purpose of establishing regional uniformity and unity is not an ultimate purpose but rather the means toward particular ends. These latter, the ultimate purposes of political organization, differ both at different levels of organization and, in greater or less degree, among different units at the same level. In particular, as will be discussed later, they differ greatly at the level of independent states, and these differences constitute the justification for the independence of each of those units. But at all levels, the individual regional unit can hope to attain its ultimate objectives, indeed may be able to survive, only if it attains an adequate degree of regional homogeneity. Consequently this universal means for diverse ends is a generic purpose of all political regions, the importance of which at times even overshadows the ultimate ends. It is appropriate therefore to examine more closely its two parts - uniformity and unity.

By political uniformity we mean that throughout the range from fundamental constitutional provisions, methods and procedures of determining who shall govern, enactment of laws and their enforcement, and the operation of all other governmental functions, all parts of the region will be alike. All will participate in the control of government to the extent that any participant and all will be under the same form and manner of control. This uniformity however may provide for certain degrees of differences under organized subdivisions, but only if the same manner and degree of local autonomy is available in all subdivisions. To the extent that particular areas of the region are treated differently by the overall organization, there is lack of uniformity and therefore lack of regional unity.

It follows from the above that the maximum degree of uniformity in detail is expected at the lowest level of subdivision, decreasing as one moves to higher levels of larger units, but even at the unit of the independent state, the common tendency is to seek a high degree of uniformity. In the absence of any higher form of political organization there is commonly no attempt to seek political uniformity among states within the same realm.

g. There are at least two cases in history that form exceptions, cases in which a group of people first organized as a social unit planning to create a politically organized region searched for a suitable location and endeavored to determine the size and shape of the area to be organized - namely, the people of Israel under the leadership of Moses, and their modern counterpart, the Latter-day Saints who under Brigham Young sought out and founded the state of Deseret. Brightman has presented an analysis of this interesting case of the organization of a political region in what at the time was almost a political vacuum /8/.

In such associations as the British Commonwealth to be sure there are no doubt unorganized efforts to maintain as much similarity in basic constitutional structure and rights of individual citizens as the independent member states are willing to accept.

The second half of the generic purpose of the political region is to make it a coherent (kinetic or nodal) region to the degree required to enable internal functions to operate successfully in all its parts. At the lowest level of subdivision the units may be so small and the functions so limited that little problem is involved. At successively higher levels, increasing size and increasing importance of political functions make the problem increasingly important. At each of these levels of subdivision it is also necessary that each individual region has sufficient coherent unity to function as a unit in relation to the outside, but since these relations are chiefly those with the government of the larger region of which it is a part, they commonly present no particular problem. At the level of the independent state however, the political region must be able to function as a coherent unit in a variety of relationships with any outside forces with which it comes in contact.

In sum, every politically organized region represents the conscious attempt of a social group, beginning at some time in the past and continuing through the present, to create a particular kind of regional homogeneity which without this attempt would not exist. In some areas, to be sure, factors independent of political organization may have produced a high degree of uniformity in social characteristics and of coherent unity in economic and social life which greatly facilitate the attainment of political homogeneity. Nevertheless in no area larger than a locality are such non-political factors of homogeneity sufficiently strong of themselves to produce the degree of political homogeneity necessary for the creation of a political region. Even in areas where the differences from place to place are slight, the difference between places in close proximity to each other and those more remote from each other is alone sufficient to create disunity unless overcome by the forces of political organization.

In the case of most political regions, however, and particularly at the higher levels of division, political homogeneity appears in marked contrast to lack of homogeneity in other respects. It is not however to be assumed that such contrast necessarily represents conflict. In the case of some factors it may have little or no significance. The difference between the level plain of eastern England and the more rugged terrain of the Weald, south of the Thames, would seem to have little relevance to the problem of political homogeneity, at least in modern times. In other cases, local differences in character of the land may lead to close interchange among districts of different economic production, as in the variegated lowland of northern France, which may actually further political unity. In many other cases however, differences in character from place to place within the area, and a pattern of nodal regions in terms of circulation that is discordant with the political region may impose serious difficulties in the establishment of political homogeneity.

Geographic Analysis of the Political Region

The conclusions summarized in the previous paragraphs indicate the first major group of problems which the political region presents to the geographer. He is concerned to measure the degree of political uniformity and coherence that has been developed, measured in terms of differences in degree in different parts of the region. To interpret these conclusions of fact he will study the regional structure and flow of political forces that make for political homogeneity in the region, and by use of the standard method of determining regional accordance or discordance seek to determine the factors that aid or handicap the attainment of political uniformity and coherent unity.

In such an analysis, the external form of the region, its size and shape, will be found significant in relation both to the political structure developed and to the patterns of non-political elements studied, in comparison to the pattern of political homogeneity. Until that comparison has been made however it would be difficult to determine what aspects of the external form are significant in the political geography of the area. Hence, a procedure which starts with these facts because they are the ones first presented on the map, would appear in reality to be an indirect approach to the major problems of concern. Indeed in some cases it may prove quite a misleading approach. Thus to start a study of Brazil with an analysis of the size and form of the area presented under that name on the common political map would tend to focus attention on the vast territory of the Amazon Basin which subsequent analysis would demonstrate was hardly to be included within the area of political uniformity which constitutes the region effectively organized as the state of Brazil, but rather represents a dependent area under remote control from that state.

It is also true that the analysis of difference in degree of political homogeneity within the region may reveal important differences due to varying lengths of time in which particular portions of the region have been included within it, or to continuance of conditions that prevailed in such districts before they were included within the present region. Full interpretation of such factors will require historical research concerning the evolution of the area of the region. In other cases however such differences from the past may no longer be significant to the present homogeneity of the region, so that it need not be assumed that a full study of the evolution of the political unit is necessary.

On the other hand the existence of any political region in its present form presents a question of interest in its own right: how did this particular area come to be a political unit? In the case of subdivisions created by the larger units of which they are parts, the problem is relatively simple, whereas in the case of independent states, the processes involved have been highly complex and such studies in historical political geography may therefore be significant in determining the processes of territorial changes among states. Thus Whittlesey's historical studies of two anomalous districts in the Pyrenees, Andorra /94/ and the less known case of the Val d'Aran /93/ lead to significant generalizations on the changing role of mountains in the

political geography of Europe, generalizations which can be shown to apply in respect also to the Alps.

It cannot however be assumed that the processes that resulted in present morphology are necessarily interrelated with the processes affecting the development of political homogeneity in the contemporary situation. Thus the difficulty of extending Spanish homogeneity across the crest of the Pyrenees into the Val d'Aran would be the same no matter what were the original reasons for the inclusion of this valley north of the crest in the political region to the south. In general, states have tended to accept any opportunity to secure additional territory regardless of whether such additions furthered or retarded the development of political uniformity and unity.

The second major set of problems concerning the geography of a political region is presented by the pattern of external relationships formed by the region as a coherent unit with other outside political regions. This pattern is formed by a system of associations, whether of direct contact along common boundaries, or of lines of connection across other political regions or across the unorganized open seas, but in every case associations of concern to the region as a coherent unit. This pattern, the geographer is concerned to analyze in terms of the space relationships of the region, and in comparison with patterns of other relationships among the areas concerned that are independent of the political organization.

As noted earlier, these external associations are of minor importance in the study of regions that are but subdivisions of larger regions, but are of very great importance in the study of independent regions, the sovereign states.

ANALYSIS OF THE INDEPENDENT STATE

Integrating Factors

To say that a state is independent is to say that in its external relations with other states it must be able to operate as an integrated individual, for if unable to do that, its effectiveness of function is restricted and under severe stress it may disintegrate and vanish from the map.

Effective integration of a political region as an independent unit cannot be produced by governmental structure alone, no matter how well-designed and skillfully managed. It requires even more the conviction of integration in the minds of all groups in all areas of the region, a feeling, that is, of identification of themselves with the region as a whole and with its organization as a political state. This identification further must be accepted as stronger than any other forms of identification that might lead to conflict - such as identification with a lesser part of the state - a section or a locality - or identification in religious communities overlapping many states, or identification with people of the same language overlapping into another state.

The geographer concerned to measure the degree of coherent unity of a state as a political region, must therefore determine what is in the minds of

the people of the various parts of that state which produces this conviction of identification to that particular state, excluding or supreme over feelings of identification with any other area or group.

Under primitive forms of political organization, individuals identified themselves with the tribe, as a larger form of the family, as a group of people living in close juxtaposition and cooperation with each other. That elements lead people to identify themselves with such larger entities, embracing people and areas they have never seen.

Throughout history, outstanding individuals in positions of leadership have been able to exert a strong personal appeal leading thousands and even millions of individuals to identify themselves as parts of the total organization of which that leader was the head. In a sense one may consider the feudal system as an attempt to convert this relationship, originally based on a personality and therefore temporary, into an impersonal and permanent system for regional political organization.

A much stronger basis for identification of the individual with his political region has been found in what we call nationalism. At its most elementary level, nationalism appears as a conversion and enlargement of the concept of kinship: the individual identifies himself with, and therefore gives willing support to, the political organization and region which he feels belongs to him, and he belongs to it, because the people of all that region and those operating the organization are kin to him. Not in the literal sense of common biological origin, but in the sense more meaningful to him that they are like him.

In some cases common religion may be accepted as the mark of kinship, but this is true only where religious affiliation determines not merely religious beliefs and activities but also a wide range of cultural and social customs and affiliations. The significance of this factor in the political division of India is well known; the complex regional pattern it presented has been analyzed in detail by Brush /11/.

In areas formerly under European colonial control, the sharp line drawn between individuals of European culture (including Americans) occupying positions of political and economic control and all native peoples, a distinction commonly recognized by color of skin, tended to produce a feeling of kinship among all native, colored groups, regardless of major cultural differences among themselves. Once independence of outside control has been secured, the question whether this feeling of kinship, based primarily on a negative factor, will be adequate to produce a positive and permanent conviction of national unity is one of the major questions facing these new states.

Most commonly the immediate evidence of likeness, accepted as kinship, is that of use of the same language. Since relatively few people anywhere in the world feel fully at home in more than one language, they feel kinship with those who speak that language, while those who speak a strange language not only seem strange on first contact, but remain permanently strangers. Hence identity of language has come to be the most common basis of identification of the individual with the nation.

Simultaneously, the individual identifying himself with a group larger than the people he knows personally in his immediate locality, extends his feeling of sharing in the land in which he lives from the immediate vicinity with which he is familiar to a much larger area. Within the area of common language and under one political organization, his own, he can travel as one at home, and what he sees becomes part of his "homeland." If he does not actually travel there, he will hear of it from his kin or read of it in his own language. Hence the region occupied by the nation of which he is a part and organized into the political region, or state, which is his, becomes as a whole his "fatherland."

There are other cultural possessions which the individual receives from the politically organized region in which he lives and which lead him to identify himself with it. These include the memories and traditions of heroic leaders and heroic events. They include the richness of literary heritage which his national state has furthered and continues to further. Since the world's literary culture is divided by language into many compartments only one of which is open to the average person, this factor tends to intensify the importance of language as the mark of the national unit.

If the factors we have named tend to be the dominant factors at the elementary level of nationalism, and continue to function as important factors at all later levels, certain other factors may be of still greater importance in regions of more mature political development. If an area has had a long history as a political region of high degree of unity, its people may find the greatest values they hold in common are the political concepts, ideals, and institutions that are represented in their political organization and furthered by it. Since this is the one domain in which the political organization has supreme control, these values, as differing from those found in other states, are inseparably bound up in the particular state; to maintain them for the individual, his state must be maintained. It is in terms of such values that the particular state can make its strongest appeal to the ultimate loyalty of the people of all parts of its region.

We conclude therefore that, while all states have the common purposes of establishing political uniformity and the maximum degree of political unity within their respective regions, each state must present to the people of its regions a specific purpose, or purposes, distinct from those of neighboring political regions, in terms of which the people of all parts of the region will identify themselves with the state organized in their region. This concept of the complex of specific purposes of each state has been called the "state-idea" by various writers following Ratzel, or by others, the "raison d'etre," or justification of the state /24:27/.

It is not to be assumed from the fact that an area is organized as an independent state that it actually embodies a distinct and well developed set of concepts or purposes representing its justification for existence. It is essential to the operation of the modern state-system, essential indeed to the maintenance of stable human relations, that every inhabited area of the earth be included under some form of political organization. The people of an area formerly included under some larger regional unit may object to the nature of the regime thus imposed on them and solely on the basis of that

negative attitude, without any common positive purposes, establish their area as an independent unit. Or the idea of the state may come from the outside; major powers may find it undesirable, from the point of view of power relations, to have the area organized as a dependency of any outside state and for that reason promote its organization as an independent unit. To accomplish this, to be sure, they must find some groups or individuals who accept that idea and are able to organize the area as a state.

Whatever the original reasons for the organization of a state, effective government will lead in time to the development of distinctive concepts penetrating into the diverse regions and peoples of the area. If the government is ineffective, specifically if it is unable to develop concepts of relations between people, the region and its state organization that create a feeling of identity, the state will, like Spain remain lacking in effective unity. Circumstances of geographical position or of historical chance may permit its continuance, or on the other hand severe stress under outside attack will bring its disintegration, as in the case of Austria-Hungary /24/. Consequently every state, if only to attain its maximum of power in comparison with others, strives to secure universal acceptance of its distinctive state-idea.

Universal acceptance of the specific state-idea in all parts of the region is greatly facilitated if there is not only uniformity of political functioning throughout the region but also uniformity in political attitudes. Consequently there is a tendency in all states to produce, whether by force or persuasion, uniformity in the basic conditions and social institutions that influence political attitudes - including language, family, school, and church. Some states, on the other hand, have met the problem of local variations in cultural characteristics by permitting, under a federal system of organization, a considerable degree of variety among semi-autonomous subdivisions, in matters that do not adversely affect the unity of the state as a whole. Such variations within sub-regions of the state-region must not, of course, conflict with the *raison d'etre* of the state. If this is a problem requiring constant adjustment in a federal state, it is by no means an insoluble one; indeed, the assurance of such a system of local control of local matters may form a part of the state-idea, as is the case in the United States, where however that fact is not always recognized, whereas in Switzerland it is universally recognized as one of the essential elements in the *raison d'etre* of that state.

To determine the particular character of the state-idea of a specific state is no simple task nor is it one for which general training in geography prepares the student. Theoretically perhaps he might expect to find the answer in studies by students in other disciplines. Generalizations concerning the concept of state and nation, however, which have been the concern of most political scientists will not help in this problem. What is needed is the distinctive concept of the particular country under study.

If the geographer cannot find the answer for his country in the studies of historians, political scientists, or perhaps cultural anthropologists, he must seek it himself. Since the idea of the state in any particular

country today is not the product of the moment, but of the constantly evolving product of a long past, this search will carry the student back into the history of the particular state, searching for those expressions of purpose that appear to have lasting influence in governing its functioning.

Internal Analysis of the State as a Region.

The regional homogeneity of a state is the product of mutual relations between the people of its various parts and the organized region as represented by its government. Wherever these relations differ notably in degree or character there is to that extent lack of regional homogeneity.

The extreme case is found in portions of certain states which are inhabited, commonly quite sparsely, by primitive people regarded as alien to the population of the dominant areas of the state, who have little or no consciousness of identity with the state, do not participate in its organization as do those of the dominant areas, but are controlled by officials sent from the dominant areas. The Indian reservations within the United States represent the last vestiges of what was once a vast area included officially in its territory but not forming part of its organized political region. Major examples today may be found in the states which border on subarctic, semi-arid or tropical wildernesses and whose official territories consist of a portion effectively organized as a region of political homogeneity - the state-area properly speaking, and, in many cases, a much larger area of dependent territory. In almost every respect excepting that of contiguity of land connections (and legal definition) the relationship between the two portions of territory is similar to that between an independent state and an overseas colony or dependency /28/.

A somewhat similar situation, more difficult to classify, is found in many Latin American countries where districts of Amerindian culture of fairly dense population passively accept government as imposed by Spanish-Americans from outside metropolitan districts. A realistic map of the political character of such a country would show a very diversified pattern.

In countries whose organization as a state is based clearly on a national group that can be identified, a first step in geographic analysis is the comparison of the area occupied by people of that nation - the national region - with the area included in the territory of the state. If the national region extends beyond the region of the state, then the state is incomplete in its stated purpose of providing unity for the nation. If on the other hand the state includes portions of the national region of another state, especially of a neighboring one, its internal unity is disrupted.

While these conclusions are theoretically clear, it may be very difficult to secure reliable data, as Hartshorne has shown in studies of such area in Europe /19; 22/. The nationality of any individual, as we have outlined the concept of nationalism, cannot be determined by his origin, language, or any other objective fact about him, but depends rather on how he identifies himself; to ascertain that concerning the population of any disputed area is extremely difficult both because it is in just such areas that fear

of reprisals discourages free expression and also, in many cases, because the individuals concerned may change their attitudes with changing conditions.

A fairly common situation is that in which the concept of overall unity in a single region of political organization is accepted by all parts of the state, but this state-idea has relatively weak hold on certain portions or perhaps on all. Thus to the people of Quebec, the regional unity of the province represents purposes of higher value than the larger regional unity of Canada. Much the same appears to be the case in many of the provinces of Spain. Similar tendencies are found in Western Australia, but in that case not because of lack of political uniformity but rather because of disunity resulting from physical remoteness and separatist economic interests.

The previous examples indicate the significant relationships that may be ascertained by comparing the pattern of political homogeneity of a state as a region with the patterns of relevant differences in character of population or of regional disunity resulting from physical separation or diverging outside connections.

Even in states in which there is a high degree of regional homogeneity based on full and even intensive support of the specific state purposes, there may be significant differences in interpretation of those purposes in different areas of the state. An obvious example is the United States, in which the fundamental principle of equality before the law, as expressed in the basic documents recording the purposes of this state, are differently interpreted in different sections of the country, differences which can be shown to correspond, though somewhat less directly than is commonly supposed, to area differences in racial composition of population /25/.

Hence the political geographer is interested in the manner in which the internal organization of political authority is divided in sub-regions in order to permit different adaptations of government to the different regional interests and attitudes. The maximum degree of divergence, within effectively unified states, is provided by the federal system as followed in Switzerland, the United States, Canada and Australia. Many other states which have followed this in form, as in some Latin American states and the Soviet Union, have in practice developed institutions and techniques of government that effectively destroy the federal principle. On the other hand many states organized basically on a centralized, single government system permit, through delegation, significant degrees of autonomy to local, indigenous, governmental units, as for example in the English counties. The government of the United Kingdom, in addition, includes a variety of special cases of local autonomy at higher level, as in Scotland, North Ireland, the Isle of Man, and the Channel Islands.

Analysis of External Relations

All the associations of one state, as the organization of a political region, with other organized areas represent relations either of cooperation or of conflict, a theme which Wright has developed in a thought-provoking essay /102/. Relationships of both kinds may be grouped as territorial, political, economic, and strategic (i.e., military).

1) Territorial relations. One of the most important topics in the political geography of a state is the extent to which it is in agreement or dispute with other states over the extent of territory included within it. Attention on immediate concrete problems has caused most of the work in this field to concentrate on cases of dispute. It might be even more fruitful to study cases in which the people of adjacent states are in complete agreement on the extent of their mutual regions. Why, for example, is there agreement in Norway and Sweden that the existing division of the populated lowlands southeast of the Scandinavian Alps represents the correct and permanent limits of the regions of Norway and Sweden? Even cases which appear at first sight obvious, such as the limit between France and Great Britain would merit more careful historical study, for though the present territorial limit is accepted as though ordained by nature, in earlier times the two states fought a long series of wars over claims of the kings of England to territories now in France.

Territorial disputes are often called "boundary problems," simply because the settlement of such a dispute requires the drawing of a precise boundary. This term would more properly be used to refer to the problems involved in the functioning of a boundary as a part of the structure of a state as a political region - namely in maintaining control of ingress and egress across the boundary, so that that line shall in fact "bound" the region. Boggs has considered certain of these problems in topical studies which will be considered later.

A third form of territorial problems arises from the use of the territory of one state for the activities of another. The most common is the use of coastal waters by trading ships of another state, in some cases by fishermen of another state. Many states are concerned with the use of railroad facilities of another state, either in order to reach to a third state, or, more importantly, to reach the sea. The development of air transport has raised a similar, but more complicated problem since there is no effective peaceful way of apprehending airplanes passing over the territory of an intermediate state. Finally, special cases of territorial problems are presented by the use of small pieces of certain states, generally minor states, for military bases of another state.

2) Political relations. The most obvious form of political relation of a state to an outside territory is that of direct political control, as over a colony, possession, dependency, or protectorate. Commonly we recognize only some twelve of the ninety odd independent states of the world as having such colonial, or imperial, dependencies. One might however, be justified in including in the same list the much larger number of states whose official territories include "internal colonial" areas of the types previously discussed.

The relation of sovereign states to their dependent areas includes a great variety of political forms. In analyzing these the political geographer will be concerned with the reality of the functioning relationships, whether or not those correspond to the legal forms proclaimed.

Less readily determinable than the areas recognized as dependencies

by international treaty are those legally independent countries which are in fact under some degree of political control by an outside state. Such control may be limited to small districts of the country, used for military bases, or though extended over the whole country may be limited in function. In the latter case, particularly, the student may search in vain for any official documents that record the realities of the situation. The dependency of the "satellite" communist states of Eastern Europe on the Soviet Union cannot be read from their mutual defense treaties.

Although the concept of independent sovereignty carries normally the assumption of equal political relations with all other independent states, many states have established special political relations with certain other states. The political geography of Canada or Australia can be understood only in terms of its membership within the (British) Commonwealth. The United States has long had special political interest in the Latin American republics. The Schuman Plan, though primarily economic in character, will result in each of its member countries having special political associations with the group in contrast with its political relations with other states. Likewise, while the North Atlantic Pact was primarily strategic in character, it contains political clauses which if implemented would tend to create a special political association of the United States and Canada with the states of Western Europe.

3) Economic Relations. The detailed operations involved in the economic relations among states are in large part carried on not by the political organizations of the states but by individuals and corporations. The sum of all these individual operations results in a total economic association between the state as a regional unit and similar other units. To determine the significance of these relationships to the region as a political unit requires an analysis of international trade, (and services and investments) somewhat different from that used in economic geography.

The first question to assess is the extent to which the economy of one state is dependent on that of others. This must then be broken down in terms of dependence on specific countries, which must be classified both in terms of their political association with the state under study and in terms of their location with respect to that state in the total world pattern.

Since economic dependence is necessarily mutual, the second question is: for which of two states engaged in economic relations are these relations most critical. Under normal peace-time conditions the answer depends on 1) the relative importance of the foreign economic relations to the total economy of each country, and 2) the relative possibilities, in each case, of alternative areas as sources for needed supplies or services or for markets for surpluses. The classic case of this kind in modern times, the economic problem of an independent Austria, has recently been re-examined by Hoffman /35/.

In view of the increasing tendency of modern states to control each its own internal economy and, for that purpose, its outside economic relations, states are increasingly functioning as economic units and the economic relations with outside areas becomes increasingly important in the politico-geographic analysis of a state.

4) Strategic Relations. In a world organized into mutually independent states among which the larger and stronger can by use of force destroy the political organization of the smaller and weaker, the existence of every state depends on its strategic situation in relation to others. Protection, by military force, against such possible attacks has from the beginning of states been one of their major external functions. With some these may be the conflict, that is war; with others, cooperation in military alliance. While a state's relations with most other states may normally be neutral, it must always consider the possibility of relations in conflict.

Every state strong enough to operate as a power factor in any part of the world either takes on, or has forced on it, strategic associations with outside areas, whether for shorter or longer periods of time. These associations form patterns of external connections which can be interpreted in terms of the pattern of power formed by political regions organized for power and, in particular, of the location of the state concerned within this pattern of power.

While the location of a state remains of course constant, the significance of that location varies with increase or decrease in the power capacity of the state itself, with similar changes in power of other organized regions, and with technological changes in transportation /32/. The fact that we have witnessed such startling changes in the technology of military movements does not mean, as many think, that the factor of distance has steadily decreased in strategic significance and is about to reach the zero point - i.e., that power available at one point can be just as effectively used against an enemy five thousand miles away as against one five miles away. One needs only to think how different would be the present war against Russian-supported forces if the scene of battle were not in Korea but say in Yucatan.

In general, it is still true that strategic relations are most important with neighboring powers, but since power located anywhere in the world can be transported to operate, though in lesser strength, as a power factor in any other area, each state must consider its full strategic situation in terms of possible strategic relations with any and all other regions of the world.^h

Summary

The four different types of associations which the state-area has with other areas of the world are of course mutually interrelated. Territorial relations of a state with its immediate neighbors are commonly of first

h. Various studies of strategic relations have been mentioned in the earlier discussion of "power analysis." This topic is discussed, from a different viewpoint, in the chapter on Military Geography.

importance in determining the character of its strategic situation. An irreconcilable conflict over a border region, Alsace-Lorraine for example, forces recognition of the neighboring state as a probable enemy. Where the situation is the opposite, as between the United States and Canada, common position in the strategic situation makes for close strategic relationship, with or without specific treaty engagements.

Close political association, notably in the case of dependencies, almost always involves close economic and strategic relations. The reverse, however, is not necessarily the case. Thus during the century following 1814, the United States had its most important economic connection with Great Britain but had no political connection with that state, other than the normal relations carried on with all other states, nor did it form any strategic association with Great Britain during that period. Eire is almost completely dependent on Great Britain both economically and strategically, but refuses to accept any special political or strategic association. For over a century the one area in which the United States did have a special political association was in Latin America where its economic interests and strategic concern were less than with Europe; on the other hand that relationship, as based on the Monroe Doctrine, was primarily an indirect result of the common strategic concern of the United States and the independent Latin American states to maintain independence from Europe.

ANALYSIS OF OTHER POLITICAL AREAS

Dependent Countries

The study of a dependent country differs in a number of significant respects from that of a sovereign state. Its evolution to its present areal form may have been due largely to competitive struggle of outside states, and determined by power conflicts whose issue was decided by events taking place thousands of miles away. So far as the dependent area itself is concerned, all that is significant is the end-result of such rivalries. This, as Whittlesey has shown for specific cases in Africa, may produce political relations quite discordant with the existing cultural or tribal regions /98; 98:127-159/.

In any dependent area there is almost always a lack of unity of purpose in the political organization of the area. This is not merely a conflict of purpose between the outside controlling state (the imperial power) and whatever indigenous political organization is permitted to exist. Because most such areas were not politically organized regions prior to imperial control, there is commonly little uniformity or unity among indigenous social and ethnic groups whose distribution forms a basic cultural pattern of political diversity within the area. These different groups may be striving for different political objectives, some through at least temporary alliance with the imperial authority, others in various forms of opposition, thus creating a pattern of regional variations in effectiveness of control.

Further, the representatives of the imperial power, official and unofficial, may be in disagreement not merely in terms of current policy but

in terms of the ultimate objectives of the political organization of the area. Thus traders and other business men operating in the colony may have a different view of its ultimate future than that of the officials operating the government and through the large cooperations of the imperial country, which they serve, may bring pressure through the home government against the government in the colony. The latter, on the other hand, though presumably functioning under direction of the colonial office of the home state, may in fact operate with a considerable degree of independence, even in conflict with principles determined by the home government. This is possible both because of remoteness from the home seat of government and because colonial officials tend to form an interested block concerned to pursue certain objectives regardless of changes in the government at home.

Finally, in areas where considerable numbers of the citizens of the imperial power have settled as permanent colonial residents, enjoying a position of social, economic and political superiority to the great native majority, these tend to form a small but powerful group whose objectives may be quite different either from that of the home government or the local colonial officials, and almost certainly in opposition to the objectives of indigenous political groups. The relative importance of this group of "white settlers" commonly varies notably in different parts of the territory, in significant relation to climatic conditions, productive capacity and developed transport routes.

The analysis of the various purposes of colonial government in any area may also be expected to show significant correspondence with the area pattern formed by districts that are of positive economic benefit to the imperial power, in contrast to the areas, commonly the greater part of the total, that are but little developed and consequently represent a net cost to control.

Viewed solely from the side of the organizing powers, the purpose of political organization of a colonial territory may approximate one of several contrasting types, and the analysis of the area as a political region will differ according to which type of purpose is involved.

1) The underlying purpose, whether consciously recognized or not, may be to maintain the present colonial control indefinitely. In that case, only a minimum of political homogeneity is required, sufficient to allow maintenance of control. Political uniformity, though in some respects advantageous, may stimulate political unity and produce dangerous challenge to imperial control. Under the dictum of "divide and rule," heterogeneity of diverse ethnic areas may therefore be encouraged. Experience however seems to indicate that this is a losing battle. The conditions pre-requisite for effective government inevitably produce an increasing degree of political uniformity and regional unity and the very effectiveness of imperial government produces common ties of opposition among otherwise opposing native groups and districts.

c) At the opposite pole, is the purpose officially declared by Great Britain as its aim in colonial rule - namely, to develop colonial territories

toward ultimate status as independent states, which it is hoped will choose to remain in association in the Commonwealth. The analysis of a colonial region in terms of this purpose would be much the same as that of the analysis of internal aspects of an independent state. On the other hand, it is necessary to determine whether the indigenous political group or groups that are to take over the organization of the region as an independent state are in agreement on that purpose, or whether, as in India they find their objectives in the division of the territory into two or more independent political regions.

3) The ultimate objective of the imperial state may be to incorporate the colonial territory into the home state as a part of its total regional homogeneity on the same basis as present portions of that state. Presumably this is the purpose of the United States in respect to Alaska. In the former colonial areas of imperial Russia, the western parts of Siberia were gradually incorporated as integral parts of the state and it is clearly the purpose of the Soviet Union to establish the same in respect to all its vast colonial domain. In the absence of reliable information on the actual operations of the Soviet government in such areas it is not possible to determine the degree to which this has been accomplished. Lattimore has considered the question in some detail in respect to the Yakut region /52/.

France has recently incorporated certain small overseas colonial territories (its West Indian and Guiana possessions and Reunion), as departments of the home-state, functioning through parliamentary representation, like the other subdivisions of the state. This is the first instance in which a state had officially defined its political region as including portions separated from the main body by thousands of miles of open ocean. Even earlier, France had originated a similar policy in regard to its North African territories, but while departments of France have been officially established in Algeria, the actual structure of government there demonstrates still a high degree of colonial control.

It is significant that in seeking to incorporate its North African colonies France has not furthered the political unity of the existing regions, as inherited from historical indigenous governments of the past. Just as the first republic, following the revolution, sought political homogeneity throughout France by destroying the historic provinces, replacing them by smaller departments to which little autonomous power was given in order to prevent development of local regions of unity, so Algeria is not kept as a unit, but is to be divided into departments, which ultimately, one presumes, would have no overall regional organization other than that of all France.

Which of the ultimate objectives the imperial power pursues will determine the present method of organization of the colonial territory. A major question is the degree to which the area is organized to function as a unit region separate from, though under the control of the imperial power, or the extent to which its internal functions are determined in detail by the government of the controlling power, even through diverse agencies of that government. Whittlesey has discussed the significant differences in this respect in different parts of colonial Africa /98:367-394/ and Pelzer has considered a similar problem in Micronesia /61/.

The external relations of dependant countries are, generally speaking, controlled by the imperial power as part of its total functioning in external relations, though in many cases indigenous government may have a share in determining these relations.

Internal organization and governmental operation are seldom carried on exclusively by the representatives of the imperial power. More commonly there is a combination, and this varies not only in different empires but in different parts of the same empire, of functions directed by the officials of the imperial power, functions handled directly by indigenous political organizations - some created by the imperial power, some adopted by it from traditional tribal systems - or finally by agencies which include both native and imperial representatives. Under any such combination, the area cannot be considered as an integral region of political organization, but rather functions as a part, or even as separate parts, of the imperial unit which includes the controlling state and all its dependant areas.

In some colonial areas two separate forms of political organization function simultaneously in the same aspect of government. Thus, in Tunisia, courts organized as part of the judicial system of France function in cases involving French citizens, while native courts operating under Moslem law handle cases involving only natives who have not become French citizens.

To determine the degree of dependence of the organization and functioning of the dependant country on that of the controlling state may be very difficult. A great variety of legal forms are recognized in imperial relationships; in the British Empire alone, the constitutional relationship is different for almost every colony. Further, the actual functioning relationship may differ greatly from the legal form. Nevertheless the geographer concerned to analyze the dependant country as an organization of area cannot avoid the necessity of determining what functions the colonial organization is intended to perform. To ignore this question would be as though one attempted to study the economic geography of a manufacturing plant established as a branch factory without considering whether it was planned to operate as an integrated unit or merely to carry out specific limited functions closely interrelated to the functions of the home establishment.

Autonomous Divisions

The political geography of organized subdivisions of states represents a potential field to which very little attention has yet been given. In view of the great interest of American political science in the operation of the governments of the individual States of the United States, it seems somewhat surprising that American geographers have so largely ignored the significance of these areas as semi-autonomous units.

As long as American political geographers were concerned primarily with problems of boundaries and disputed territories, this field offered a great number of specific historical problems primarily of local interest only. Many of these are presented in a series of maps in the Atlas of Historical Geography

of the United States /59/, and individual cases have been studied in more detail by Cushing /14/, Ullman /81/, Brightman /8/, and Thomas /78; 79/. Ullman, in addition has presented a detailed examination of the effect of an inter-state boundary on local development in the area through which it crosses /81/.

Territorial disputes between the States of the United States in recent times have arisen chiefly where the boundary line ran through water bodies. In two cases in which such disputes were of considerable practical importance, and were finally settled only by decision of the United States Supreme Court, geographers contributed studies of practical value: Bowman's study of the Red River boundary, cutting through an oil field which was ultimately divided between Texas and Oklahoma /7/; and Martin's studies of the Michigan-Wisconsin boundary between two cities on the Menominee River and in Green Bay /56/. It does not seem likely however that further opportunities will occur.

Likewise there seems little gain, other than intellectual exercise, in considering imaginary changes in territorial division of the United States among its forty eight units. Whereas nearly every war involves in its settlement changes in territorial units, the limits of the States of the United States may well be assumed to be immutable, short of a revolution whose character or results could not be predicted.

On the other hand, the problems presented each of the States by the particular geographic structure of its area are very real and significant. In the American federal system, these units are much more than subdivisions, like the departments of France; in a variety of respects each functions independently of the national federal government. Furthermore, the existence of these forty-eight units operating under a common framework provides a valuable laboratory for political geography. For whereas every national state differs in significant degree in major functions, or purposes, the major functions of these State units are largely similar. But each must carry out those similar functions over an area unique in geographic character.

American geographers have long been aware of certain outstanding problems presented by certain particular States. A familiar theme, more important in an earlier period but still significant, was the problem found in each of the South Atlantic States from Virginia to Georgia, of establishing regional unity in an area which in each case included two contrasting sections, often in conflict, a portion of the coastal plain and a portion of the Piedmont.

Thomas has considered the problem of maintaining connections between the physically separated parts of Idaho /77/ and many students have commented on the problems of maintaining common interest over the two radically different regions of Washington, sharply separated by the Cascades. But these are only the more obvious cases; every State has its peculiar problems arising from its particular structure and location. Years ago a journalist pointed to the special problem of New Jersey, as a political region whose two main economic foci were in two outside States. Pennsylvania is obviously split between two industrial regions clearly separated from each other, and each focused on its own metropolis. On the other hand, if North Dakota is economically homogeneous, the emphasis on one major surplus product, wheat, presents grave fiscal

problems in times of depression.

It is a paradoxical result of our school system that while we have had numerous books on the economic geography of particular States, no one of which functions as an economic unit, a thorough-going study of the political geography of even one of the States, the one respect in which it does operate as a unit, has not been made. Here is an opportunity for research of practical value and requiring no foreign travel.

Similar opportunities, obviously, are to be found in the relatively few other states that function under a federal system, including Canada, and Australia.

Subdivisions

The first level of subdivision properly speaking, i.e., that at which the units are determined and controlled by the larger organization of which they are but a part, is represented by counties in this country and in England and by departments in France. A primary question at this level is that of the method and pattern of the subdivision. While major changes in any of these countries are legally possible, the pattern developed in the past, in the case of France in the drastic reorganization at the time of the Revolution, appears to be now firmly implanted. A few changes, however, are currently made in some of our western States; discussion of a proposed reorganization of counties in Oregon led Stephen Jones to prepare a study of the geographic structure of that State in terms of nodal regions recognized in practice by various governmental and business agencies - a study that led to conclusions significantly different from those which would have been drawn from direct reference to physical features /42/. In the same general category should be mentioned Hanson's study of Utah /18/, and Ullman's review of several studies in the Pacific Northwest /82/.

In most parts of the United States, the county has little legislative power, but rather functions as a subdivision of the administrative and judicial branches of State government, but personnel carrying out such functions are chosen independently of the State government, by local vote, and for that reason no doubt counties (and larger cities) represent the basic area units of American political parties. In most of the counties of the country, it has been said, local government tends to remain in the control of the same party over long periods of time. This provides a faithful core of party workers who can normally be counted upon in every election regardless of wider State or national issues. This hypothesis suggests a number of opportunities for geographic studies, whether in terms of individual counties chosen for case studies, or of differences among the counties of a single State or group of States, or of the overall situation in the United States.

The next lower subdivision, the township, is of such minor functional importance in most parts of this country as to appear to offer but little material for analysis. On the other hand, the "towne" in New England represent

1. For a general analysis of the different units of government of the States of the United States, with conclusions as to optimum size, see Anderson, T. "The Units of Government in the United States." Public Administration Service Publication # 42, Chicago, 1934.

regions of local organization more important than the counties.^j In view of the notable changes that have taken place since these towns were established, changes in economy, population groups, and outside connections - many a New England town would offer opportunity for comparative study of problems in an area small enough to be fully covered by field work. A student might well expect to find in miniature many problems more difficult to analyze in larger areas.

The political geography of cities is also a field but little touched by American geographers, including those specializing in urban geography. The fact that the political city seldom coincides with what has been called the "geographic city," may have discouraged such studies. But this very situation presents city governments with one of their most difficult problems, to which Harold Meyer has given considerable attention. Characteristically the large American city is an economic and social entity whose political organization controls but a part of the area and population involved in its economic and social organization. At the same time, city governments are expected to supply an increasing number of economic services to all the population entering the city in day-time hours, including the large number residing in areas organized in completely separate political units. An extreme case of political independence of a small portion of an urban center, leading to almost exclusive use for industry, is reported by Nelson /58/.

In addition to the standard area units of general government, there are in the United States a number of types of territorial organization for special purposes which either include a particular group of standard units or even cut across them. As examples, each quite different from the other, we may mention the Port of New York Authority, the Tennessee Valley Authority, or, at a lower level, a school district which includes several townships, or parts thereof. A current dissertation in geography by Beveridge, at the University of Illinois, analyzes problems arising from local regional differences in the development of a consolidated school district, problems involving annexation and secession of pieces of townships.

Finally, there is an important field for geographic study represented by areas which while not officially organized as political regions nevertheless are found to function politically as unit regions, with greater or less degree of unofficial organization. In the more primitive areas of the world such unofficial political regions may in fact represent the only effective political organization present. Thus Platt has shown that in the upper reaches of the Amazon such local organizations may even straddle, and ignore the legal international boundaries of sovereign states /62/, and many Indian communities in

j. The term "town" is used in New England, rather than "township" for the unit area of organization below that of county, regardless of whether rural or urban in character. "Town meeting" is the meeting of all the citizens of a township.

the Andes show similar independence of official political organization.

Even within highly organized states, unformalized political organizations of regions may play a significant role; a notable case is the political block that re-forms its ranks in the American Congress whenever the special regional interests of the South appear to be at stake. On the other hand, it should not be assumed that this case represents an example of a general situation, as though the United States consisted of a group of such functioning regions; Kollmorgen has warned against easy acceptance of popular ideas on this subject /49/.

Political Organizations at Higher Levels

Geographers have long recognized the need for studies of organized political areas at levels above that of the individual sovereign state. The most common is that of an "empire," composed commonly of one independent state and its dependent areas. As generally understood such units have the peculiar structure of widely separated parts, connected only through the international seas; but, as previously noted, the compact territory officially credited to Brazil, Canada, or the Soviet Union, represents in each case such a composite of state and dependent territories.

The "Commonwealth of Nations" (formerly called the British Commonwealth) represents a different type, until recently the unique case, namely, a loosely organized, but nonetheless effective, association of dependent states. Since various of its unit members also hold dependent territories, the total organization is extremely complex. An adequate analysis of the political geography of such an organization of area must involve more than a series of studies of each of its parts; it must describe and interpret the interrelations among those parts that account for the reality of the total system as a form of organization of territory.

In a different category are a variety of "leagues" or associations of independent states each organized for specific and limited purposes. We do not include even here, however, the ordinary military alliance which commonly represents no more than an agreement on a particular aspect of foreign policy. A clear example is the Arab League, a regional organization of states having some common internal interests as well as external purposes, which has attempted to function as an inter-state organization. NATO, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has perhaps gone farthest in integration of military forces and has at least charter authority to develop as an economic and political association of states. Whereas such a transoceanic association, involving countries in three continents, seems to the layman as non-regional in character, geographers should be among the first to demonstrate the intrinsic regional unity of the countries bordering the North Atlantic.

When the student of political geography attempts to look beyond the present to the foreseeable future, as surely he should, he finds a host of problems in interstate organization that call for study. Perhaps the most obvious and pressing is the question of unification, or at least greater degree

integration than now exists, of Western Europe. This question presents problems of high intellectual value to the geographer as well as of practical importance to statesmen. It is unfortunate that we do not have a group of workers trained in the analysis and interpretation of existing states as integrated regions who could apply that training to an analysis of the relevant regional differences among the several units of Western Europe and draw tentative conclusions as to what structural forms and functions would be efficacious in uniting these regions into an overall region that could develop into a going concern.

In the international field, as well as at lower levels, we recognize the existence of certain regional associations of states that function without official organization. Thus, Scandinavian states, bound together by proximity and by linguistic, cultural and political similarity, have at various times cooperated as a loose unit in international affairs and this cooperation continues even though they are now split within and without the North Atlantic Treaty Organization. The Latin American states have tended to operate as a block in many international relations, but at other times, as Platt has explained, divergent economic and strategic interests pull them widely apart /63/. In each such case the geographer is presented with a set of contrasting patterns of centripetal and centrifugal forces resulting from elements of regional homogeneity and heterogeneity, of which the total resultant varies in relation to specific outside problems from strong regional unity to complete regional disunity.

World Organization

Finally, we are living in the age of the great experiment in political organization of the world region, the experiment which began in 1919 with the League of Nations and has been resumed since 1945 with the United Nations. In comparison with all other official organizations of areas into regions, this organization of the world region is extremely weak in structure and function. Like the Commonwealth of Nations (the British Commonwealth) but unlike federal states, its structure is that of an association of governments of political regions, with no direct authority reaching inside the regions themselves; and unlike the Commonwealth it has no historic tradition and no similarity of political institutions to bind it together.

Founded primarily on the negative purpose of preventing catastrophe, the world organization will have difficulty in finding universal appeal until and unless it has opportunity to convince the peoples of all parts of the world region that it has prevented such a catastrophe. In the meantime, however, it has developed numerous less striking functions contributing to the welfare of the world region in matters of universal interest, such as health and living standards.

That these contributions do not lead to world-wide conviction that every part of the world has an important stake in the world political organization is probably not so much due to criticism of the weakness of structure of that organization, of which so much is heard, but rather reflects the fact that in spite of all that is said, and can be demonstrated, of the unity of

the world in terms of economic life, health, freedom and security of the individual, relatively few people as yet in any part of the world are conscious of the reality of this world community for which a political organization is needed.

This sketch of the current situation of the United Nations is sufficient to suggest numerous specific topics for geographic analysis. In addition, the primary function for which the organization was established, that of suppressing international conflict that may arise, presents difficult and complex problems in world strategy of power used to prevent or crush war. The United Nations appears to be lifted above the surface of the earth as though it operated without reference to differences in specific location, reaching conclusions on the basis of multiple translation of speeches at meetings held at will in New York, Paris or any other center. A more realistic view of its capacity to maintain international security requires an analysis of the units of power that can be placed in its service by its individual members, power units that are distributed in specific locations and which must be evaluated in terms of space relationships to each other and to the location of possible or actual theaters of action.

TOPICAL STUDIES

Purpose

Throughout the discussion of the study of regions of political organization in the previous sections there has been recurrent mention of particular elements, whether of structure or function, whether material or immaterial, that were found to be significant in the analysis of homogeneity of individual regions or in the relations among them. To further the evaluation and interpretation of these elements as factors both in relation to the individual regions and in relation to the regional political organization of the world, there is need for comparative studies focused on specific elements or topics as they are found in many regions, or over the entire world.

Such comparative studies should lead to generic concepts and categories facilitating precise description and evaluation. Further, the study of the processes, the cause and effect relationships, in which a particular element is involved in different situations may enable the construction of hypotheses, even permit the demonstration of principles of cause and effect relationships, which in the individual case of a single country can only be more or less intelligently surmized.

As in all other branches of geography, therefore, topical studies are no less necessary than area studies. We have considered the latter first because the tentative analysis of areas should indicate which of the great number of possible topics are likely to be of most importance for understanding the total world pattern.

Topics That Have Been Studied

It is evident that this had not been the procedure by which American geographers have selected particular topics for study in political geography.

The most notable development of systematic study of any topic in this field has been in the study of boundaries, whether because they form the most obvious feature in political geography or because of predominant concern over the practical problems of territorial disputes.

Whatever the reasons for the attention given this topic, the results appear to be of more lasting value than in any other aspect of political geography. Building on the earlier work of various European geographers, as well as their own experience in the field or in governmental service, Hartshorne /19; 21; 22/, Boggs /2/ and Stephen Jones /40; 41; 45/ have constructed generic concepts and categories of international boundaries that are far more precise and useful than were previously available, in particular, dispensing one may hope with the common but misleading division between "natural" and "artificial" boundaries. This latter topic has also been examined critically by Broek /9/ and by Fischer /16/ and Pounds has studied the historical origin of this concept which has been so influential in French political thought /64/.

The most thorough and detailed examination of a particular type of political boundary is provided by Boggs' series of studies on the problems associated with boundary lines drawn through water bodies /1; 4; 5/. Of a different category is Hartshorne's attempt to provide a systematic approach to the study of territorial disputes in areas of long established development by people of different nationalities, an approach which analyzes the regional overlap of factors pertinent to the determination of homogeneous political regions /23/. Much of the work of these many studies is summarized, and amplified in Stephen Jones' masterly handbook on "Boundary Making" /45/. They provide not only intellectual tools useful for analysis of specific area problems but make possible tentative hypotheses concerning the qualifications that make it most likely that a particular division of territory will prove acceptable to both sides or will provide a boundary line that will cause least difficulty in effective operation of boundary controls.

A second feature made obvious on the common political map, the location of capital cities, to which British geographers like Fairgrieve and Cornish had given considerable attention, has been much less studied by American geographers. Perhaps they felt that the location of capitals in the United States, whether federal or state, was geographically less significant than in countries where capitals appear to have become established because of intrinsic advantages of location rather than by legislative fiat - as though any seat of government could be located other than by conscious decision of the government. Or, perhaps, they had less interest in a topic which appeared unrelated to current practical problems and the study of which required intensive historical research. Whittlesey however has utilized this topic as an effective approach to the study of political regions in East Central Europe and in Latin America /98:195-234, 461-475/.

Topics Needing Study

A survey of the problems involved in the political geography of individual areas, whether a random survey through current literature or such systematic analysis as was presented earlier in this chapter, reveals a large number of topics less obvious than boundaries and capitals, but which may be no

less, perhaps more, important to an understanding of political differentiation of areas. Few of these however, have been studied systematically. Thus, various students have designated an area of particular location and political function by one or more of the following terms: hearth, cradle, heart, core, nucleus, kernel or focus, but there is no agreed understanding of the concept involved. Even such older terms as "buffer state" or "pioneer zone" remain ambiguous in meaning, because of lack of systematic study to determine categories.

One topic emerges from our abstract discussion of the geography of contemporary states as most in need of comparative, systematic study - namely, the character and ingredients of a nation. Not the significance of nationalism in general to the development of states, which has been well developed by political scientists, but the analysis of what differences in nations are significant to the organization of political regions as units independent of each other.

For the nation is not merely a social group; it is also a phenomenon of area, commonly monopolizing a core area of complete regional homogeneity in this respect, though extending in many cases into marginal areas of heterogeneity. Certain characteristics may be common to all nations, and national areas, certain others are found in some but not all nations, and each nation has its unique qualities or purposes that differentiate it from all others. Until we have analyzed the qualities and purposes that are critically important in the differences among nations, we will not be able to make the contribution that geography should provide towards an understanding of the regional organization of the world into independent political units.

Methods of Securing Generalizations

In political geography, as in other branches of the field, generic concepts and principles may be borrowed from the related systematic sciences. As political scientists develop increasing concern for the study of individual states, rather than of the state in general, geographers may expect more aid from their work. Geographers may also look to the work of cultural anthropologists and social historians for light on the determination of distinctive differences among national groups.

One great difficulty in topical studies in political geography when focused on aspects of independent states is the small number of similar cases. There are considerably less than one hundred existing specimens of this species and each of them is so different from all others in both its political and its geographic aspects, as to place each in a class by itself. The number of cases can, to be sure, be considerably increased by borrowing from the past, but the further one digs back, the more different is the framework of reference fundamental motivations both of groups and of individuals, and relations among states were basically different in past periods.

It has therefore been suggested that more progress might be made by focusing attention on studies of subdivisions of particular states. Thus the United States presents forty-eight units each having essentially the same

political functions and purposes to carry out each within a unique geographic area. Much greater numbers can be utilized if one works at a lower level of subdivision. It seems likely that such systematic studies might lead to sound generalizations of principles and it is quite conceivable that at least some of these would then prove useful in the study of independent states.

HISTORICAL POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY

In any of the branches of geography that include the works of man, it should be a truism that every study will involve, repeatedly, the use of the historical approach. Human beings, farms, factories, cities, nations and states do not appear in any area instantaneously; neither is their character at any present moment the product merely of present conditions. Much that exists now can only be understood in terms of past conditions, which may no longer exist, but which were determinant during the period of development. Hence it should be understood that in all of the previous sections of this chapter it is assumed that interpretation of the present political geography will require repeated dips into the sequence of development that underlies it.

In a different category however are placed those studies in which the focus of interest is in the past. If political geography is of value in understanding the present character of the political world, it is of no less value in understanding that of any time in the past. If such studies lack the practical importance of contributing directly to the solution of vital problems, they are of no less intellectual interest and scientific value; on the contrary the absence of the overpowering concern for immediate decisions provides a clearer atmosphere for objective analysis and, in many cases, makes available to the scholar a large amount of data which in the case of present problems may still be locked in classified documents and unpublished diaries. Finally, study of the political geography of past periods increases enormously the materials available for comparative studies in systematic political geography.

Because political geography in America has been stimulated largely by current world problems, the vast storehouse of materials from past periods has been little exploited. The most notable exceptions are studies by Whittlesey, such as the chapters in The Earth and the State which concentrate on the political geography of Western European countries during the medieval period /98:Chaps. 5, 7, 10, 13, 16/, and certain of the works by Lattimore, such as his "Historical Geography of the Great Wall of China" and other sections of his Inner Asian Frontiers of China /51/.

Other American geographers have occasionally presented studies focused on the political geography of a past period, such as Hartshorne's studies of the Franco-German boundary of 1871 /30/, or his paper, published only in abstract, on the regional heterogeneity of the Austro-Hungarian empire /24/. The interest of the Berkeley school of historical geography is represented in political geography by Stanislawski's two studies of political organization in certain areas of Mexico, one in pre-Columbian time /74/, one in the colonial period /75/.

Relatively little has been done in the political geography of earlier periods of United States history, though the chapter on the United States in

Whittlesey's volume is largely concerned with past periods /98:chap. 16/. Of the many problems of political organizations of regions in our past history, two would appear to be of special interest at a time when there is great concern over the integration of independent units into larger regional wholes. The historian Jensen has demonstrated that prior to the Constitutional adoption of the Constitution of 1789, the United States was not a mere association of independent states unable to function as a unit, as many earlier writers have claimed, but in many respects operated as a single state /39/. His study might well be tested by geographic analysis to assess the degree of regional uniformity and unity that existed in the period under the Articles of Confederacy. Likewise it would be fruitful to subject to similar examination the Confederacy of the South, during its brief period of existence, to peer under the cloud of political hysteria and war to determine in what degree the establishment of that temporary political unit represented regional homogeneity within itself and regional distinctness from the northern part of the country.

A somewhat different method of inquiry from which fruitful results might be expected is the study of any particular area through a series of periods, as Jones and Mehnert considered Hawaii's position in the Pacific /43/. Thus one might analyze the political geography of the region centering on the Mid-Danube in the early period of formation of Austria and Hungary, then in the period of maximum Turkish advance, then on the dual monarchy, followed by the secession states after World War I, and finally, for the present, the period of Soviet domination. A somewhat less embracing study, which might well provide insight into the difficult problem of determining the distinctive features of a particular nation would be a geographic study of, say, French nationalism during the centuries of its development. Such a study would seek from historical sources, to determine the elements of that complex both as they developed in character and as they spread in regional extent. Such a study should throw light on such questions as to what degree the French nation was developed by the state, to what degree the national region spread beyond the contemporary area of the state, to be followed later by extension of the state.

APPLIED POLITICAL GEOGRAPHY

Political geography in the United States has been predominantly concerned with the application of geographic knowledge to specific and contemporary political problems - primarily problems of international relations. Many of the studies of this kind have been made for agencies of the United States government, most of which have not been published; others have been published for academic purposes or to inform the general public concerning current problems.

Political geography received its first major impetus in this country as a result of public interest in territorial settlements made necessary by the upheaval of World War I. Dominian's now classic study of Frontiers of Language and Nationality in Europe /15/, published in 1917, was written primarily to provide a basis for anticipated revisions in the regional organization of Europe. Other American geographers, as noted earlier, contributed to the

background materials used by President Wilson at the Peace Conference. One of them, Bowman, was stimulated by his work there to incorporate brief summaries of the territorial disputes of all parts of the world in his volume on The New World, /6/, a work which however went far beyond that type of problem and proved to be the most influential work in American political geography.

During the ensuing two decades of official American withdrawal from European affairs, such service within the government was limited almost exclusively to the Geographer of the State Department, and was concerned primarily with territorial problems ^{in Latin America and detailed boundary problems between the United States and its immediate neighbors, Canada and Mexico.} As a result of his work on a large number of such problems, Boggs published in 1940 a volume of lectures on International Boundaries /2/, and it was largely through his influence that Stephen Jones prepared his handbook on Boundary Making as a guide to treaty-makers and boundary commissioners /45/.

As the United States became involved in World War II, a large number of geographers were drawn into government service. While most of these were working on military problems, a large number of studies of territorial problems were made by the greatly augmented staff of geographers in the State Department, by Bowman as special adviser to the President, and toward the end of the war, by geographers working in the Office of Strategic Services, subsequently transferred either to the State Department or to the Central Intelligence Agency.

In the meantime a few geographers in academic circles had published analyses of individual cases of territorial disputes, either before or after official settlement. Hartshorne examined the consequences of the partition of Upper Silesia in an attempt to develop sound techniques for examination of such a problem in the field /19/. Platt's examination of "Conflicting Territorial Claims in the Upper Amazon" illuminates the disruptive effects of international dispute resulting from ill-defined boundary lines in tropical forest areas remote from developed regions /62/. The problems resulting from the addition of the South Tyrol district of German population to Italy following World War I have been re-examined in terms of the situation following the second war by both Weigert /87/ and Hoffman /34/; and latter has also published a detailed analysis of the Netherlands demands for changes along its boundary with Germany /36/. Under the direction of Van Valkenburg, students at Clark University have completed a number of doctoral dissertations on specific problem areas, at least one of which, Held's study of the Saarland, has been published in part /33/. The boundary problem of greatest intensity in the Far East, that in Korea, has been examined in two studies by McCune /57; 57a/.

Of studies of a less technical character, designed for general and adult education, mention may be made of Van Valkenburg's surveys of problems in several larger realms, published as Headline Books of the Foreign Policy Association /85/.

Since the field of political geography is far wider than the study of territorial disputes, the opportunities for application of scholarly studies to practical problems is far larger than has hitherto been realized. Wherever it

is politically feasible to change the areas of political units, as of provinces or counties, there is opportunity and need to apply whatever knowledge has been acquired in political geography to practical problems. We have already noted Stephen Jones' contribution to the division of Oregon into new counties, at a time when that appeared to be a current issue /42/.

A greater number of opportunities may be expected in the field of government planning. Wherever such plans overlap existing political units, the problem of determining what extent of territory to include and the problem of organizing that territory into a functioning unit are problems to which the student of political geography should be able to make significant contributions.

Perhaps the greatest opportunity may come in the field of urban government. It now appears quite likely that the problems resulting from expansion of cities into suburban areas and over satellite cities may result less often in simple annexation enlarging the central city, but rather in establishment of some form of overall government, with limited functions, for metropolitan districts, within which the previous political units may retain considerable autonomy. Since every such case presents unique problems not to be solved by universal rules, the geographer trained in the study of local differences and interrelations, should be able to play a significant role in analyzing the specific situation and recommending solutions.

SUMMARY

A great part of the work in political geography has been produced by geographers who have not specialized in this branch of the field but who have been called on to make studies in it, either because of their special knowledge of problem areas or because of positions they held in government service. Consequently the literature in the field shows more substance than organization or method. It has therefore seemed desirable not to divide the material in this chapter in terms of inventory and forecast, but rather to present an organized outline of the topics that need to be analyzed and interpreted in the study of political likenesses and differences of areas and the relations among areas classified in terms of political likenesses and differences. A major part of those topics is concerned with areas organized politically as regions, regions both in the sense of uniformity and in the sense of coherent unity.

The citations noted in reference to each portion of the outline give some indication of the development to date of studies on that particular subject, and the sum total of these through the chapter may stand as an inventory. It is clear that the undeveloped portions of the field constitute the greater part and the discussion of these topics presents the opportunities for future work, in terms of a systematic framework that should enable successive students to build upon the work of their predecessors. Work in a field of knowledge may be initiated by students who pitch in wherever need arises or opportunity beckons, but the continued production of studies not related to each other or to any organization of knowledge will not produce, by sheer accumulation even over indefinite time, a useful and reliable body of knowledge. In geography, as in all branches of science, knowledge should increase at a geometric rate made possible by the establishment of fundamental concepts, and principles and

methods within an organized framework, on the basis of which subsequent students can progress far more rapidly and surely than their predecessors.

In such a development of an organized body of knowledge in political geography, important contributions will be made not only by those who will specialize in this branch of the field. Every geographer concerned with phenomena of area that result from differences in the character and work of man in different places will find that the interpretation of his data involves, among other factors, the political organization of the areas in his study. More especially, those who dig deep into the geography of particular areas - and surely this will include at one time or another every geographer - will have both the opportunity and the need to analyze the pattern of politically organized regions in his area and the relations among those regions. Such an analysis is not merely an end-chapter, not to say postscript, in the study of the geography of an area. In view of the direct and indirect effects of political regions on all patterns of human development, the political geography of an area is an essential and intrinsic part of its total geography. Every area specialist therefore has need of political geography and has opportunity to contribute to its development.

References

1. Boggs, S. W. "Problems of Water-Boundary Definition," Geographical Review, 27 (1937): 445-456.
2. Idem. International Boundaries. New York, 1940.
3. Idem. "This Hemisphere," U.S. Department of State Bulletin, 12 (1945): 845-850; republished in 70.
4. Idem. "Delimitations of Seaward Areas under National Jurisdiction," American Journal of International Law, 45 (1951): 240-266.
5. Idem. "National Claims in Adjacent Seas," Geographical Review, 41 (1951): 185-209.
6. Bowman, I. The New World: Problems in Political Geography, New York, 1921, 1928.
7. Idem. "An American Boundary Dispute, Decision of the Supreme Court of the United States with respect to the Texas-Oklahoma Boundary," Geographical Review, 13 (1923): 161-189.
8. Brightman, G. F. "The Boundaries of Utah," Economic Geography, 16 (1940): 87-55.
9. Brook, J.O.M. "The Problem of Natural Frontiers," Frontiers of the Future, University of California Press, 1941.
10. Idem. "Diversity and Unity in Southeast Asia," Geographical Review, 34 (1944): 175-195.
11. Brush, J. E. "The Distribution of Religious Communities in India," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 39 (1949): 81-98.
12. Crisler, R. M. "Republican Areas in Missouri," Missouri Historical Review, 42 (1948): 11 pp.
13. Idem. "The Little Dixie Region of Missouri," Summaries of Doctoral Dissertations, Northwestern University, 17 (1949): 352-356.
14. Cushing, S. H. "The Boundaries of the New England States," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 10 (1920): 17-40.
15. Dominian, L. Frontiers of Language and Nationality in Europe. New York, 1917.
16. Fischer, E. "On Boundaries," World Politics, 1 (1949): 196-222.
17. Glenn, L. C. "Physiographic Influences in the Development of Tennessee," The Resources of Tennessee, April 1915: 44-63.

18. Hanson, G. H. "The Geographic Factor and its Influence in Utah Administrative Units," Yearbook of the Association of Pacific Coast Geographers, (1937):3-8.
19. Hartshorne, R. "Geographic and Political Boundaries in Upper Silesia," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 23 (1933):194-228.
20. Idem. "Recent Developments in Political Geography," American Political Science Review, 29 (1935):764-804, 943-960.
21. Idem. "Suggestions on the Terminology of Political Boundaries," Mitteilungen des Vereins der Geographen an der Universität Leipzig, Heft 14/15 (1936):180-192.
22. Idem. "The Polish Corridor," Journal of Geography, 36 (1937):161-176.
23. Idem. "Survey of the Boundary Problems of Europe," in C.C. Colby ed., Geographic Aspects of International Relations. Chicago, 1938:163-203.
24. Idem. "The Tragedy of Austria-Hungary: A Post-Mortem in Political Geography," abstract, Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 28 (1938):49.
25. Idem. "Racial Maps of the United States," Geographical Review, 28 (1938):276-288.
- 25a. Idem. "Agricultural Land in Proportion to the Agricultural Population in the United States," Geographical Review, 29 (1939):488-492.
26. Idem. The Nature of Geography, originally published in Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 29 (1939):Nos. 3 and 4; republished by the Association, Washington, 1949.
27. Idem. "The Concepts of 'Raison d'etre' and 'Maturity' of States," abstract, Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 30 (1940):59.
28. Idem. "The Politico-Geographic Pattern of the World," Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 218 (1941):45-57.
29. Idem. "The United States and the 'Shatter Zone' of Europe," in 90: 74-88.
30. Idem. "The Franco-German Boundary of 1871," World Politics, 2 (1950): 209-250.
31. Idem. "The Functional Approach in Political Geography," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 40 (1950):95-130.
32. Idem. "Where in the World Are We?" Journal of Geography, forthcoming.
33. Held, C.C. "The New Saarland," Geographical Review, 41 (1951):590-605.

34. Hoffman, G. W. "South Tyrol: Borderland Rights and World Politics," Journal of Central European Affairs, 7 (1947):285-308.
35. Idem. "The Survival of an Independent Austria," Geographical Review, 41 (1951):606-621.
36. Idem. "The Netherlands Demands on Germany: A Post-War Problem in Political Geography," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 42 (1952):129-152.
37. Huntington, E. Mainsprings of Civilization. New York, 1945.
38. James, P. E. "Geopolitical Structures in Latin America," Papers Michigan Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters, 27 (1941):369-376.
39. Jensen, Merrill. The New Nation. New York, 1960.
40. Jones, S. B. "The Forty-Ninth Parallel in the Great Plains: The Historical Geography of a Boundary," Journal of Geography, 31 (1932):357-368.
41. Idem. "The Cordilleran Section of the Canada-United States Borderland," Geographical Journal, 89 (1937):439-450.
42. Idem. "Intra-State Boundaries in Oregon," The Commonwealth Review, (University of Oregon), 16 (1934):105-126.
43. Idem. (with H. Mehnert). "Hawaii and the Pacific," Geographical Review, 30 (1940):358-375.
44. Idem. "Field Geography and Postwar Political Problems," Geographical Review, 33 (1943):446-456.
45. Idem. Boundary Making: A Handbook for Statesmen, Treaty Editors and Boundary Commissioners, published for the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace by Columbia University Press, 1945.
46. Idem. in the series, Memoranda of the Yale Institute of International Studies: #12. "Australia, New Zealand and the Security of the Pacific," 1944; #17. "Africa and American Security," 1945; #29 "The Arctic: Problems and Possibilities," 1948.
47. Idem. (with M.F. Murphy). Geography and World Affairs. Chicago, 1950.
48. Kish, G. "TVA on the Danube," Geographical Review, 37 (1947):274-303.
49. Kollmorgen, W. "Political Regionalism in the United States - Fact or Myth," Social Forces, 15 (1936):111-122.
50. Langhans, M. "Karte der Selbstbestimmungsrechtes der Völker," Petermanns Mitteilungen, 72 (1926):1-9.

51. Lattimore, O. Inner Asian Frontiers of China, American Geographical Society Research Series No. 21, New York, 1940.

52. Idem. "Yakutia and the Future of the North," American Quarterly on the Soviet Union, 1947; republished in 91: 135-149.

53. Idem. The Situation in Asia. Boston, 1949.

54. Mackinder, H. J. "The Geographical Pivot of History," Geographical Journal, 23 (1904); expanded in Democratic Ideals and Reality, New York, 1919, 1942.

55. Idem. Britain and the British Seas, Oxford, 1906, 1930: Chap. 1.

56. Martin, L. "The Michigan-Wisconsin Boundary Case in the Supreme Court of the United States," and "The Second Wisconsin-Michigan Boundary Case in the Supreme Court of the United States," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 20 (1930): 105-163 and 25 (1935): 77-125.

57. McCune, S. "Physical Bases for Korean Boundaries," Far Eastern Quarterly, (1946): 272-288.

57a. Idem. "The Thirty-Eighth Parallel in Korea," World Politics, 1 (1949): 223-232.

58. Nelson, H. J. "The Vernon Area, California - A Study of the Political Factor in Urban Geography," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 42 (1952): 177-191.

59. Paullin, C. O. Atlas of the Historical Geography of the United States. New York, 1932.

60. Percy, G. E., and Fifield, R. H. and Associates. World Political Geography. New York, 1948.

61. Pelzer, K. J. "Micronesia - A Changing Frontier," World Politics, 2 (1950): 251-266.

62. Platt, R. S. "Conflicting Territorial Claims in the Upper Amazon," Geographic Aspects of International Relations, C. C. Colby, (Ed.) Chicago, 1938: 243-276.

63. Idem. "Latin America in World Affairs," Journal of Geography, 40 (1941): 321-330.

64. Pounds, N. J. G. "The Origin of an Idea of Natural Frontiers in France," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 41 (1951): 146-157.

65. Ratzel, F. Politische Geographie. Munich, 1897.

66. Reitzel, W. The Mediterranean, Its Role in America's Foreign Policy. New York, 1948.
67. Roucek, J. S. "The Geopolitics of the Balkans," American Journal of Economic and Social Affairs, October 1946: 365-377.
68. Sprout, H. H. "Political Geography as a Political Science Field," American Political Science Review, 25 (1931): 439-442.
69. Sprout, H. and M. "Command of the Atlantic Ocean," Encyclopedia Britannica, 1943 edition.
70. Idem. Foundations of National Power. New York, 1945, 1951.
71. Spykman, N. J. "Geography and Foreign Policy" and (with A. A. Rollins) "Geographic Objectives in Foreign Policy," American Political Science Review, 32 (1938): 28-50, 213-236; and 33 (1939): 391-410, 591-614.
72. Idem. America's Strategy in World Politics. New York, 1942.
73. Idem. The Geography of Peace. New York, 1944.
74. Stanislawski, D. "Tarascan Political Geography," American Anthropologist, 49 (1947): 46-55.
75. Idem. "The Political Rivalry of Patzcuaro and Morelia, an Item in the Sixteenth Century Geography of Mexico," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 37 (1937): 135-144.
76. Taylor, G. (Ed.) Geography in the Twentieth Century. New York, 1951: Chaps. 1, 6, and 25.
77. Thomas, B. E. "Boundaries and Internal Problems of Idaho," Geographical Review, 39 (1949): 99-109.
78. Idem. "Demarcation of the Boundaries of Idaho," Pacific Northwest Quarterly, 40 (1949): 24-34.
79. Idem. "The California-Nevada Boundary," Annals of the Association of American Geographers: 42 (1952): 51-68.
80. Troll, C. "Geographic Science in Germany During the Period 1933-45," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 39 (1949): "Geopolitics," 128-135.
81. Ullman, E. L. "The Historical Geography of the Eastern Boundary of Rhode Island," Research Studies of the State College of Washington, 4 (1936): 67-87.
- 81a. Idem. "The Eastern Rhode Island - Massachusetts Boundary Zone," Geographical Review, 29 (1939): 291-302.

82. Idem. "Political Geography in the Pacific Northwest," Scottish Geographical Magazine, 54 (1938): 236-239.

83. United States Department of Agriculture, Office of Foreign Agricultural Relations. Agricultural Geography of Europe and the Near East. Washington, 1948.

84. Van Valkenburg, S. Elements of Political Geography. New York, 1939.

85. Idem. Headline Books, Foreign Policy Association, New York: European Jigsaw, 1945; Pacific Asia, 1947; Whose Promised Land? 1948.

86. Walsh, E. A. "Geopolitics and International Morals," in 90: 12-39.

87. Weigert, G. C. "Effects of Boundary Changes in the South Tyrol," Geographical Review, 40 (1950): 364-375.

88. Weigert, H. W. Generals and Geographers: The Twilight of Geopolitics, New York, 1942.

89. Idem. "Mackinder's Heartland," The American Scholar, 1946, republished in 91: 80-90.

90. Weigert, H. W. and V. Stefansson, editors. Compass of the World, A Symposium on Political Geography. New York, 1944.

91. Weigert, H. W. and V. Stefansson and R. E. Harrison, editors. New Compass of the World, A Symposium in Political Geography. New York, 1949.

92. Whittlesey, D. "Geographic Factors in the Relation of the United States and Cuba," Geographical Review, 12 (1922): 241-256.

93. Idem. "Trans-Pyrenean Spain: The Val d'Aran," Scottish Geographical Magazine, 49 (1933): 217-228.

94. Idem. "Andorra's Autonomy," Journal of Modern History, 6 (1934): 147-155.

95. Idem. "Political Geography: A Complex Aspect of Geography," Education, 50 (1935): 293-298.

96. Idem. "The Impress of Effective Central Authority upon the Landscape," Annals of Association of American Geographers, 25 (1935): 85-97.

97. Idem. "Reshaping the Map of Africa," Geographic Aspects of International Relations, C. C. Colby, editor, Chicago, 1938: 127-159.

98. Idem. The Earth and the State, New York, 1939.

99. Idem. German Strategy of World Conquest. New York, 1942: 70-152.

100. Wigmore, J. H. "A Map of the World's Law," Geographical Review, 19 (1929): 114-120.

101. Wright, J. K. "Voting Habits of the United States," Geographical Review, 22 (1932): 666-672.

102. Idem. "Training for Research in Political Geography," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, 34 (1944): 190-201.